

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Huehnergard, John

THE AKKADIAN DIALECTS OF CARCHEMISH AND UGARIT

Harvard University

PH.D. 1979

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES



THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE
(To be placed in Original Copy)

The undersigned, appointed by the

Division

Department of Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations

Committee

have examined a thesis entitled

The Akkadian Dialects of Carchemish and Ugarit

presented by John Huehnergard

candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and hereby
certify that it is worthy of acceptance.

Signature *Thomas O. Lambdin*

Typed name Thomas O. Lambdin

Signature *William L. Moran*

Typed name William L. Moran

Signature

Typed name

Date September 14, 1979

The Akkadian Dialects of
Carchemish and Ugarit

A thesis presented

by

John Huehnergard

to

The Department of
Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the subject of
Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations

Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

September, 1979

to my parents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Professor William L. Moran, my teacher in Assyriology, and my advisor in this study, for his thorough instruction and unfailing encouragement, both before and during the time the study was in progress.

I wish, too, to thank Professor Thomas O. Lambdin, for his systematic instruction in comparative Semitic philology.

The advice and guidance of these two extraordinary scholars and teachers has always been given abundantly and unselfishly, and will be evident throughout the dissertation.

NOTE: Two important works appeared too late to be used for this study: Claude F.M. Schaeffer, ed., *Ugaritica VII* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1978); and Thomas John Finley, "Word Order in the Clause Structure of Syrian Akkadian" (Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1979).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABBREVIATIONS	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
PARTS I (THE AKKADIAN DIALECT OF CARCHEMISH) AND II (THE AKKADIAN DIALECT OF UGARIT)	
	Carchemish Ugarit
A. THE CORPUS	17 164
B. NOTES ON ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY	
a. Logograms	21 172
b. The Determinatives MEŠ and HI.A	21 172
c. Extra Initial Vowel-Signs	22 175
d. Double Final Root Consonants	22 175
e. Other Incorrect Double Consonants	23 175
f. Extra Vowel-Signs	24 176
g. Broken Writings	24 176
h. The Vowels <i>i</i> and <i>e</i>	24 177
i. <i>uparris+uperris</i>	26 184
j. <i>ia+ā</i>	26 185
k. Initial and Medial <i>w</i>	26 186
l. Mimaton	26 186
m. Š before Dentals	28 188
n. Root-final Dental/Sibilant + Š	28 189
o. Confusion of <i>s</i> and Š	28 189

p. Nasalization of Double Voiced Stops	29	190
C. MORPHOLOGY		
1. <i>Personal Pronouns</i>		
a. Independent	30	191
b. <i>attu-</i>	30	192
c. Genitive Suffixes	30	192
d. Accusative Suffixes	32	196
e. Dative Suffixes	33	199
2. <i>Other Pronouns</i>		
a. The Anaphoric Pronoun	34	202
b. <i>annû</i>	37	204
c. Interrogative Pronouns	37	204
d. Indefinite Pronouns	37	205
e. <i>gabbu</i>	41	212
3. <i>The Noun and Adjective</i>		
a. Declension of the Unbound Form	42	215
b. The Bound Form before Nouns .	47	219
c. The Bound Form with Suffixes .	48	222
d. The Absolute State	50	225
e. The Predicative State	50	-
4. <i>The Verb</i>		
a. The Markers of Person	51	226
b. The Ventic	55	237
c. The Subjunctive	60	242
d. The Derived Conjugations . . .	63	243
e. Weak Verbs	67	249

5. <i>Prepositions</i>		
a. Simple Prepositions	73	262
b. Compound Prepositions	79	268
6. <i>Adverbs</i>		
a. Simple Adverbs	82	273
b. Expressions for "Forever"	-	279
7. <i>The Enclitic Particle -mê</i>	87	281
8. <i>Markers of Direct Speech</i>	89	281
9. <i>Assyrian Forms</i>	91	284
D. SYNTAX		
1. <i>Word Order</i>		
a. Verbal Clauses	93	288
b. Clauses with the Stative	95	294
c. Nominal Clauses	95	296
2. <i>Modification of the Noun</i>		
a. By an Adjective	98	303
b. By a Noun in the Genitive	99	304
c. By a Relative Clause	104	310
d. By a Noun in Apposition	105	310
3. <i>Agreement</i>	106	311
4. <i>Unspecified (Impersonal) Subject</i>	109	318
5. <i>Negation</i>	110	319
6. <i>The Particle lû</i>	112	321
7. <i>Non-coordinating Enclitic -ma</i>	113	322
8. <i>Coordination of Clauses</i>		
a. Coordination with -ma	117	325

b. Coordination with <i>u</i>	120	327
c. Coordination with <i>-ma u</i>	126	329
d. Coordination with <i>ū</i>	127	329
e. Asyndetic Coordination	128	330
9. <i>Subordination</i>		
a. Conditional Sentences	129	330
b. Relative Clauses	134	332
c. Other Subordinate Clauses . . .	138	335
10. <i>The Use of the Tenses</i>		
a. Preterite and Perfect	141	341
b. Durative	150	351
c. Imperative and Precative . . .	152	354
d. Stative	153	355
11. <i>The Construction of the Infinitive</i>	155	359
12. <i>The Syntax of the Accusative Case</i>		
a. General	157	362
b. The Resumptive Accusative Suffix	158	365
13. <i>Incomplete and Interrupted Grammar</i>		
a. Ellipsis	159	369
b. Oaths	160	370
c. Parenthesis	161	370
d. Casus Pendens	162	371
e. Anacoluthon	163	372
PART III. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION		373
BIBLIOGRAPHY		388

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

A	adverb; adverbial (or prepositional) phrase
acc.	accusative
Adler, AKTM	Hans-Peter Adler, <i>Das Akkadische des Königs Tušratta von Mitanni</i>
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i> (Berlin: Graz)
AHw	Wolfram von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i>
Akk.	Akkadian
AkkAL	see Giacomakis, AkkAL
AkkBo	see Labat, AkkBo
AKTM	see Adler, AKTM
ALM	see Finet, ALM
AnOr48	Loren R. Fisher, <i>The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets, Analecta Orientalia</i> 48
Ap	sentence- or clause-initial adverb or adverbial phrase
Aro, Glossar	Jussi Aro, <i>Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen</i>
Aro, Infinitivkonstruktion	Jussi Aro, <i>Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen</i>
Aro, SMBG	Jussi Aro, <i>Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik</i>
ArOr	<i>Archiv Orientalní, Journal of the Czechoslovak Oriental Institute, Prague</i> (Prague)
AS ³	Wolfram von Soden and Wolfgang Röllig, <i>Das akkadische Syllabar</i> , 3rd ed.
Ass.	Assyrian
AT	D.J. Wiseman, <i>The Alalakh Tablets</i>
Bab.	Babylonian

BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i> (Baltimore)
BiOr	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i> (Leiden)
"BoAkk"	see Durham, "BoAkk"
Böhl, <i>Sprache</i>	F.M.Th. Böhl, <i>Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe</i>
Bush, "Hurrian"	Frederic W. Bush, "A Grammar of the Hurrian Language"
"Byblos"	see Moran, "Byblos"
C	consonant
CAD	A. Leo Oppenheim et al., eds., <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago</i>
Conj.	conjunction
dat.	dative
DN, DN	divine name
dur.	durative (form)
Durham, "BoAkk"	John W. Durham, "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian"
EA	J.A. Knudtzon, <i>Die El-Amarna Tafeln</i>
Ec.	economic text
ex(x).	example(s)
f, f.	feminine
Finet, <i>ALM</i>	André Finet, <i>L'accadien des lettres de Mari</i>
FN, FN	feminine name
GAG	Wolfram von Soden, <i>Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik samt Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik</i>
GAL	Wright, <i>GAL</i>
gen.	genitive
GHB	see Jøthn, <i>GHB</i>

Giacumakis, AkkaZ George Giacumakis, Jr., *The Akkadian of Alalah*

GKT see Hecker, GKT

Glossar see Aro, Glossar

GN, GN geographical name

Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln see Salonen

Hecker, GKT Karl Hecker, *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte*

"Hurrian" see Bush, "Hurrian"

Hurro-Akkadisch see Wilhelm

imper. imperative

infin. infinitive

Infinitivkonstruktionen see Aro

J legal (juridical) text(s)

JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (New Haven)

JCS *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* (Cambridge, Massachusetts)

JNES *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* (Chicago)

Joüon, GHB Paul Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*

JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies* (Manchester)

K Carchemish; text or the corpus of texts written at Carchemish

L letter(s)

Labat, AkkBo René Labat, *L'akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*

LB Late Babylonian

lit. literally

m, m. masculine

MA Middle Assyrian

- Mayer, UGMa Walter Mayer, *Untersuchungen zum Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen*
- MB Middle Babylonian
- MEA⁵ René Labat and Florence Malbran-Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*, 5th ed.
- mng. meaning
- Moran, "Byblos" William L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets"
- Moran, "Syrian Scribe" William L. Moran, "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Unity and Diversity*
- MRS *Mission de Ras Shamra*
- n. note
- NA Neo-Assyrian
- NB Neo-Babylonian
- no. number
- nom. nominative
- O direct object
- OA Old Assyrian
- OAkk Old Akkadian
- OB Old Babylonian
- obv. obverse
- OrNS *Orientalia Nova Series* (Roma)
- p plural
- p. passim
- p(p). page(s)
- "Parataxis" see Patterson, "Parataxis"
- Patterson, "Parataxis" Richard D. Patterson, "Old Babylonian Parataxis..."

perf.	perfect
pl.	plural
PN,	masculine personal name
prec.	precativc
pret.	preterite
PRU	Jean Nougayrol, <i>Le palais royal d'Ugarit (III, IV, VI)</i>
q.v.	which see
r	reverse
RA	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i> (Paris)
RÉS	<i>Revue des études sémitiques</i> (Paris)
RSO	<i>Rivista degli studi orientali</i> (Roma)
s	singular
S	subject
Salonen, Gruss-	und Höflichkeitsformeln Erkki Salonen, <i>Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen</i>
SB	Standard Babylonian
sg.	singular
SMbG	see Aro, <i>SMbG</i>
<i>Sprache</i>	see Böhl <i>Sprache</i>
subjn.	subjunctive
s.v.	under the word in question
Swaim, "UgAkk"	Gerald G. Swaim, "A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets found at Ugarit"
Sy	<i>Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie</i> (Paris)
"Syrian Scribe"	see Moran, "Syrian Scribe"

T	treaty text(s)
U	Ugarit; text or the corpus of texts written at Ugarit
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i> (Neukirchen-Vluyn)
Ug. 5	Jean Nougayrol et al., <i>Ugaritica V</i>
"UgAkk"	see Swaim, "UgAkk"
UGMa	see Mayer, <i>UGMa</i>
UT	Cyrus H. Gordon, <i>Ugaritic Textbook</i>
v, V	vowel
V, V(o)	verb, verb with pronominal acc. suffix
voc.	vocative
vs.	versus
Wilhelm, <i>Hurro-Akkadisch</i>	Gernot Wilhelm, <i>Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi</i>
WPA	western peripheral Akkadian
Wright, <i>GAL</i>	W. Wright, <i>Grammar of the Arabic Language</i>
WS	West-Semitic
x	illegible sign
1,2,3	persons of the verb or pronominal system
*	a text whose place of origin is not absolutely certain
**	indicates less certainty than *
*	indicates the following form is reconstructed or not attested
!	scribal error
[]	text broken
< >	scribal omission
<< >>	scribal plus
:	transliterates a "Glossenkeil" (✱) in the text

INTRODUCTION

The present work is a descriptive grammar of two groups of texts, one composed by scribes at the ancient city-state of Ugarit (modern Ras Shamra), the other originating in ancient Carchemish (modern Jerablus). All but five of the texts that will be considered were unearthed at Ras Shamra during the excavations, since 1929, of the French *Mission de Ras Shamra* (MRS), under the direction of Claude F.A. Schaeffer. Nearly all of the Akkadian documents that have been published to date were copied, transliterated, and translated by Jean Nougayrol, in four publications of the MRS.¹ The remaining texts are a small number that appeared prior to these volumes, and that were not republished in them,² and four texts taken illegally

¹All under the general editorship of Claude F.A. Schaeffer; in particular: *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, III (= MRS VI): *Textes accadiens et hourrites des archives est, ouest et centrales*, 1955; IV (=MRS IX): *Textes accadiens des archives sud*, 1956; VI (=MRS XII): *Textes en cunéiformes babyloniens des archives du grand palais et du palais sud d'Ugarit*, 1970; *Ugaritica V* (=MRS XVI): *Nouveaux textes accadiens, hourrites et ugaritiques des archives et bibliothèques privées d'Ugarit...*, 1968. All published in Paris at the Imprimerie Nationale. Hereafter: (PRU) 3,4,6, (Ug.) 5, respectively.

²These may be found in the following: E. Dhorme, "Petite tablette accadienne de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 16 (1935) 194f. (6.345); idem, "Lettre du roi de Kargamish au roi d'Ugarit," in *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud* (Paris: Paul Guenther, 1939), 203ff. (8.333, republished, in transliteration only, in PRU 3:7f.); F.

from Ras Shamra that were later recovered, and issued in a separate publication.³

The five texts not found at Ras Shamra are royal letters to the Egyptian court, all certainly or probably from Ugarit. They are part of the great archive of international correspondence found at El-Amarna (ancient Akhet-Aton), and appear as numbers 45 to 49 in J.A. Knudtzon's edition of the letters.⁴

The Akkadian tablets found at Ras Shamra that have so far been published number over seven hundred. Those written at Ugarit itself consist of (a) copies of letters from the royal court to the courts of other states, and to local officials, and letters of local officials to the king of Ugarit and to fellow administrators; (b) a great number of texts which document several different kinds of legal

Thureau-Dangin, "Un comptoir de laine pourpre à Ugarit d'après une tablette de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 15 (1934), 137ff. (Latakia); idem, "Trois contrats de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 18 (1937), 237ff. (8.145; 8.208; 8.213; note: 8.208:1-12 was republished, in transliteration only, in *PRU* 3:110f.); Ch. Virolleaud, "Cinq tablettes accadiennes de Ras-Shamra," *RA* 38 (1941), 1ff. (10.046=*PRU* 3:9f.; 11.856; 11.839=*PRU* 3:194f.; 11.787=*PRU* 3:194a; 8.043); idem, "Six textes de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 28 (1951), 163ff. (14.16).

³Loren R. Fisher, ed., *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets, Analecta Orientalia* 48 (Roma: Pontificium Biblicum Institutum, 1971). The tablets were probably taken from Ras Shamra sometime in 1957; they were acquired by Fisher for the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in 1970. Text 1957.1 was treated by Fisher (pp. 11ff.), 1957.2-4 by M.C. Astour (pp. 23ff.). Hereafter: *AnOr* 48.

⁴*Die El-Amarna Tafeln* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915; reprinted, Aalen: Otto Zeller, 1964). Hereafter: *EA*.

cases;⁵ (c) many economic dockets (lists of personnel, rations, tools, and so on); (d) copies of religious and literary texts; and (e) texts pertaining to the scribal art (syllabaries and vocabularies).

The Ras Shamra texts that were written elsewhere, that is, the international archives, consist of (a) letters from the royal courts of Khatti, Carchemish, Amurru, and Siyannu/Ushnatu, as well as one or two each from several other states,⁶ and a small number of letters from ambassadors of the Ugarit court who were posted in some of those states; (b) treaties between Ugarit and its neighbors Amurru and Siyannu, or imposed by its overlords Khatti and Carchemish; and (c) legal documents involving parties of more than one state, also promulgated by Ugarit's overlords or neighbors.

* * *

Although the content of these tablets has received considerable attention, the grammar has not. Nougayrol's presentation of the texts is consistently excellent; few of his interpretations, and even fewer of his readings, fail to be correct under close scrutiny. But apart from a small number of notes, the purpose of which was to jus-

⁵The largest group are the royal grants of real estate; there are also texts concerning private grants, sales, purchases, exchanges, liberations of slaves, adoptions, guarantees, and the like. An analysis of the content of these documents was presented by G. Boyer, in *PRU* 3, 281ff.

⁶Alashiya (Cyprus), Amqu, Assyria, Beirut, Mukish, Parga, Qadesh, and Sidon.

tify particular readings or translations, and many of which are quite general, he devoted only a few pages to a brief summary of the grammar of the texts.⁷ The projected volume describing the grammar unfortunately never appeared.⁸ Articles by other scholars which have dealt wholly or in part with the grammar of the tablets have normally been in the form of reviews of the *MRS* publications,⁹ and a review is obviously an inconvenient format at best for such matters, and not conducive to detailed investigation.

However, there is an earlier dissertation treating the grammar of the texts found at Ras Shamra,¹⁰ and so the question must be asked: is there a need for a fresh study? Several points argue for an affirmative answer. The most obvious is that Swaim's study was completed before *Ug.* 5 and *PRU* 6 appeared, increasing considerably the number of texts available. That fact alone would merit at least an appendix to the earlier work.

Secondly, Swaim and all other scholars who have discussed this material have taken a synoptic approach,

⁷*PRU* 3, xxxvf.

⁸Cf. *PRU* 3, xxxvi, n. 2.

⁹E.g., J. Aro, *Afo* 18 (1957-58), 143f.; C.H. Gordon, *RA* 50 (1956), 127ff.; L. Matous, *ArOr* 24 (1956), 375ff.; A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3 (1973), 34ff.; idem, *IOS* 5 (1975), 18ff.; E.A. Speiser, *JAOS* 75 (1955), 154ff.

¹⁰Gerald G. Swaim, "A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets Found at Ugarit" (Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1962); University Microfilms number 63-5831.

grouping all the texts together, regardless of their place of origin or their genre, and presenting their grammar as though it were a unified system. But in fact, as this study will show, there are differences, some them major, between the texts from different locales. In this work, only the texts from Ugarit (U) and Carchemish (K) are considered, but the observation applies to the tablets from other regions as well. There are often differences between letters and legal texts besides. And, in the largest group of texts studied here, the legal documents written at Ugarit, a few differences can even be discerned between texts of different date. A study which groups all the texts together, therefore, cannot be more than a compendium of attested forms, usages, and styles. Few scholars today would present an undifferentiated grammar of the Amarna tablets,¹¹ for it would avail little, for example, to cite an imperfective *iparras* from a letter of Burnaburiash of Babylon alongside a *yaprusu* from a letter of Rib-Addi of Byblos. Rather, the most profitable recent studies of that corpus have dealt with texts from individual areas, or at least taken their disparate origin into account.¹² While the

¹¹Seventy years ago, F.M.Th. Böhl did publish such a monograph, the value of which is limited not merely because of its age, but also because of its presentation: *Die Sprache der Amarna Briefe* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich, 1909).

¹²E.g., W.L. Moran, "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets" (PhD. Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1950) - hereafter

differences in the texts found at Ras Shamra may not always be as great or as obvious, they nevertheless require the same approach.

Another consideration, in some ways related to the last, concerns the presentation of the material itself. Several grammars of Akkadian dialects, especially of peripheral Akkadian (including the previous study of the Ras Shamra texts), are essentially lists of forms found in a given corpus. But it is possible, and, I believe, important, to go beyond that, to attempt to describe fully the dialect, whether a living spoken one, or strictly a written one,¹³ of the individuals who composed the documents now at our disposal. This involves, then, presenting not merely the forms, but also the ways in which they were used, the conditions and limits on their occurrence. It also involves

"Byblos"; idem, "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*," *OrNS* 29, 1ff.; idem, "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Unity and Diversity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1975), 146ff. - hereafter: "Syrian Scribe"; C. Kühne, *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von El-Amarna, AOAT 17* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973). A.F. Rainey, "Reflections on the Suffix Conjugations in West Semitized Amarna Tablets," *UF* 5, 235ff.; idem, "Morphology and the Prefix-Tenses of West Semitized El-Amarna Tablets," *UF* 7, 395ff.

¹³The question, whether the Akkadian dialects of Ugarit and Carchemish were simply written systems employed by native scribes, or, in fact, real languages spoken by at least a part of the upper class (namely, the royal court, the nobility, and, of course, the scribes), can only be considered in conjunction with all texts from areas where Akkadian was not the native language. The topic is a large and complex one, and beyond the scope of this dissertation.

an investigation of the syntax of each dialect, for there are dialectal peculiarities in that category as well as in the phonology and morphology. An examination of the syntax is conspicuously lacking, or only rudimentary, in many Akkadian dialect studies. Finally, a study of a group of peripheral Akkadian tablets should describe not only the similarities to, and deviations from, native Akkadian, but also attempt to describe the origin and development of those deviations, and, where possible, draw any relevant conclusions concerning the substrate dialect influences at work.¹⁴ I hope to have made in the present work at least a beginning in these directions for the dialects of Akkadian at Ugarit and at Carchemish.

* * *

The present study, undertaken at the suggestion of Professor W.L. Moran, was originally to have encompassed all the texts found at Ugarit. It soon became obvious, however, that the number of texts, and the number of locales from which they originated, rendered such a scope impractical. It was decided, therefore, to work only with texts from the best represented areas. But, although texts from the royal Hittite court are actually more numerous than those from Carchemish, the former have been excluded,

¹⁴Cf., e.g., G. Wilhelm, *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*, AOAT 9 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970), and the studies of Moran and Rainey cited in n. 12, above.

for two reasons. First, many of the Khatti texts are badly damaged, to the extent that little of value could be said about their syntax. Secondly, and more importantly, according to the principles outlined above, the grammar of the texts found at Ras Shamra which originated in Khatti should be examined in conjunction with all other texts known to have been written there at approximately the same time. This, too, it was deemed, was an unmanageable corpus for a study of this size.

Therefore, the present work is not a grammar of the texts discovered at Ugarit, but rather two studies: one of the dialect of Akkadian written at Ugarit, the other of the dialect of Akkadian written at Carchemish. In a final summary, the major differences between the two, and the major similarities between them in areas in which they differ from native Akkadian, are considered. The corpus for the study of each dialect consists of all texts known to have been composed, or very probably composed, at each site. Thus, the five Amarna tablets that are certainly or probably from Ugarit are included in that corpus; no Carchemish texts other than those found at Ugarit are known.

Since it is almost certain that all the literary and religious texts found at Ras Shamra were copied from Mesopotamian originals, they have been excluded from the corpus; their grammar would not be normative for Ugarit Akkadian.

Some of the scribal texts may have been composed at Ugarit. Although they contain information for the lexicon, and, not infrequently, about the phonology, they will often represent learned scribal tradition, not normative Ugarit Akkadian grammar. Therefore, it was deemed preferable to omit them, for the present, from consideration in the following study.

For determining which of the texts were written at Ugarit or at Carchemish, a list compiled by C. Kühne,¹⁵ of all published syllabic cuneiform texts found at Ras Shamra, was a great aid. The list was consulted for each text, although not followed in every case. Texts that were obviously written in either of these city-states are those that mention that the king, queen, or crown prince has sent them, or, in the case of most legal documents, that say the case was tried in the presence of (*ana panī*) the king. In other instances, the presence of a royal seal was assumed to be indicative of origin. There remain, of course, a number of broken texts where the name of the sender or promulgator and the seal are missing. Some of these could be included in the corpora on the basis of content alone. In other cases, the sender of a letter is an official, *probably* at Ugarit or Carchemish. Such texts are included in the study only if there is little doubt as to their origin. Nevertheless, some uncertainty must remain, and all such texts have been marked in this work with *. (Texts whose

¹⁵"Eine analytische Liste der akkadischen Ugarittexte," *UF* 6, 129ff., with "Nachträge und Berichtigungen..." *UF* 7, 515f.

origin in either Ugarit or Carchemish is possible, but not as probable, are marked with **, and normally cited only in the notes, where appropriate.) Reasons for the inclusion or exclusion of particular texts are given below in the first section of each part.

* * *

As was mentioned above, Nougayrol's treatment of the texts is superb. Only in a few instances have new interpretations or readings been suggested, and these are almost invariably due to reconsiderations of the grammar in the relevant passages. Normally, when the readings followed here differ from Nougayrol's, the fact is pointed out in a note.

Personal, divine, and geographical names have not been considered in this study.¹⁶ Quite often, such forms are not affected by the grammar of their clauses. When they are, they generally present no new information. Therefore, all names have been indicated simply by the designations PN, FN (for women), DN, or GN.

The orthography of all the texts found at Ugarit is essentially the same as that of other WPA text groups;¹⁷

¹⁶On personal names, see Frauke Gröndahl, *Die Personen-namen der Texte aus Ugarit* (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1967); cf. also M. Liverani, "Antecedenti del diptotismo arabo nei testi accadici di Ugarit," *RSO* 39, 131ff.

¹⁷Cf. Moshé Berkooz, *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian* (Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University

that is, there is much confusion of signs for voiced, voiceless, and emphatic consonants, interchange of signs *CI* and *CE*, and so on. In general, the orthography does not vary significantly from one center to another in the Ras Shamra tablets, and very few local peculiarities occur. Thus, it is not necessary to discuss it in detail for each individual dialect. Further, the discussion of the orthography presented in Swaim's dissertation¹⁸ has not become outdated by the subsequent publication of new texts. Since it is pointless to repeat this evidence, there is no systematic presentation of it in the present work. Rather, only a few notes on the few peculiarities attested, and some new data, will be given.

The phonology is presented as a series of observations on matters relevant to determining the relationship of each dialect to native Babylonian or Assyrian, and to each other. Features of phonology that are common to all dialects of Akkadian, such as certain consonantal changes (for instance, **iṣṭabat*→*iṣṣabat*), or syncopation of short unaccented vowels, (for example, **parisū*→*parsū*) are not normally discussed.

of Pennsylvania, 1937); John W. Durham, "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976) - hereafter: "BoAkk"; Th.V. Gamkrelidze, "The Akkado-Hittite Syllabary and the Problem of the Origin of the Hittite Script," *ArOr* 29, 406ff.; Guy Jucquois, *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniens du nord et de l'ouest* (Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, 1966); René Labat *L'akkadien de Boğhaş-köi* (Bordeaux: Librairie Delmas, 1932) - hereafter: *AkkBo*; Moran, "Syrian Scribe".

¹⁸Op. cit. (above, n. 10), chapter 1.

"Morphology" in the following sections is in general to be understood in a rather literal sense, namely, examination of the forms attested, their construction and frequency, and their relationships and peculiarities vis-à-vis normal and other peripheral Akkadian. For the sections on "syntax" have been reserved nearly all analysis of the function and interaction of words within clauses, and of clauses within sentences.

The treatment of the stative in this work follows the traditional interpretation, of most grammarians of Akkadian, that it is part of the verbal system. This is not to imply, however, that I am in disagreement with the excellent study of G. Buccellati,¹⁹ who suggests that the stative should be considered part of the nominal system, that is, the predicative state of the verbal adjective, so that, for example, *paris/parsāku* "he is/I am decided" is morphologically and syntactically equivalent to *šar/šarrāku* "he is/I am king," namely a predicative nominal form (adjective in the case of *paris*, noun in the case of *šar*) plus an enclitic nominative pronoun (for example, 3ms - \emptyset ; 1s -*āku*).²⁰ Buc-

¹⁹"An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence," *JNES* 27, 1ff.

²⁰Cf. *ibid.*, 5f. Buccellati examines the conditions in which the predicative state is found, and summarizes on p. 10: "the nominal predicate of the nominal sentence occurs regularly in the predicative state (= stative), except when the predicate is immediately followed by a qualification or complement, or by the particle -*ma*, in which case the normal or construct states are used."

cellati's evidence and arguments are in fact very convincing, and his conclusions should be accepted for normal Akkadian grammar. But those conclusions affect more than the morphology; they have an important impact on our understanding of Akkadian syntax, namely--and this is Buccellati's main point--that clauses containing the stative are in fact nominal (or non-verbal) clauses. It is with this corollary that problems arise in our two corpora, especially in the Ugarit texts. For example, in nominal clauses in U, in which the predicate is a noun in the normal (unbound) or the bound form, it usually follows the subject (see below, 296f.). But when the predicate is a stative, it often precedes the subject, just as true verb forms often do (see below, 295f.). Further, although attributive adjectives always agree with their nouns in number, the predicative verbal adjectives (that is, statives), again, like true verbs, occasionally do not (see below, p.312). In more general terms, it may be said that the U scribes treated the stative as another verb form, in part perhaps because it resembled their own WS **qatala*.²¹

Another problem is the unlikelihood that the U scribes made use of the predicative state for nouns (*šar*, *šarrāku*).

²¹It must be pointed out, however, that *semantically* the stative is treated no differently than in normal Akkadian, that is, it is rarely active (except in such cases where it is active in normal Akkadian, e.g. *našū*, etc.), as is often the case in certain Canaanizing Amarna dialects: e.g., *šaprāta* "you wrote" EA252:5 (letter of Labayu).

If they did not, the noun and the stative were also treated differently morphologically. Unfortunately, no clear instances, in which a noun in the predicate state would be used in normal Akkadian, occur in U or in K with the noun written syllabically, to allow us to see its shape. A possible example in U is: *ša[niṣṣa]* SUM.MEŠ-nu²² "Secondly, it is a gift" 3:102:3; for *nidnu*, normal Akkadian would presumably have *nidin*. But Buccellati himself presents several examples, from other WPA texts, of the form *šarrum šū* for "he is king" instead of expected (*šū*) *šar*.²³ It is reasonable to expect that the U scribes too would have been unfamiliar with the predicative state for nouns. Thus, the stative would not have been a nominal form in their concept of the grammar. Therefore, it seemed the more logical alternative to to present the stative in U as part of the verbal system. In the section on word order, however, the stative is treated separately, to show the evidence more clearly.

The situation in K, the grammar of which, as this study will show, is most often very close to MB, is not clear. The arguments concerning word order and agreement

²²The form is probably sg., since the pl. of *nidnu* is normally *nidnūtu* (occasionally *nidnātu*) in U: e.g., SUM.MEŠ-ti an-nu-ti 3:145:31; cf. l.27. The MEŠ sign often appears without indicating plurality; see below, 172ff.

²³Op. cit., (see above, n. 19), 9, and nn. 33-37. Buccellati notes, p. 7, that the construction *šarrum šū* "is not regular Akkadian."

given above with respect to the U texts do not apply in K. No forms such as *nīdnu* or *nīdīn* are found--no appropriate situations occur. Therefore, it is impossible to know whether a K scribe would have written **anāku tupšarru* or **tupšarrāku*. But, for convenience of reference, and symmetry of presentation, the stative in K has been dealt with as in U, that is, in the traditional fashion; again, however, it is considered separately in the section on word order.

* * *

For each of the grammatical features considered in the following sections, the data were gathered and examined separately for each of the text types in the corpus. If differences between any of the genres are apparent for a given feature, the genres are presented separately for that feature, and compared. But if no significant differences are found, the evidence of all the text types is combined and presented as a whole. Generally, there are fewer differences in the morphology than in the syntax. Further, the legal texts and treaties with few exceptions exhibit the same grammar.

Texts found in the publications of the *MRS* are cited by three Arabic numbers: the first is the volume number, that is: (*PRU*) 3, 4, 6, (*Ug.*) 5; the second is the page number, with a letter (a, b, c) indicating which text on a page, if there are two or more with the same line numbers; the

third is the line number. The five Amarna tablets are cited by text and line number as found in Knudtzon's edition,²⁴ with the prefix *EA*. The tablets in *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets*²⁵ are cited by page and line number, with the prefix *AnOr*48. Texts published only in periodicals are cited by page and line number, with an abbreviation of the name of the periodical as prefix. The excavation numbers of the tablets are not used in this work, apart from the list of texts in each corpus. For those numbers, and the findspots of the individual tablets, the reader is directed to Kühne's list, mentioned above.²⁶ As was noted, an asterisk (*) indicates that the origin of the text in the area of the dialect under consideration is very likely, but not absolutely certain, while a double asterisk (**) indicates less certainty.²⁷

²⁴See above, n. 4.

²⁵See above, n. 3.

²⁶See above, n. 15.

²⁷Note: throughout this study, ḫ in transliterations and normalizations of Akk. words will be represented by *h*, for typographic simplicity. In transliterations of Ugaritic words, however, *h*, ḫ , and ḫ are always distinguished.

PART I

THE AKKADIAN DIALECT OF CARCHEMISH

A. THE CORPUS

The K corpus consists of 40 texts. They are listed below by their *MRS* excavation numbers; the place of publication, by which they will be cited hereafter, follows in parentheses.

a. *Letters* (L):

8.333 (3:7f.)	17.423 (4:193)
15.77 (3:6f.)	20.22 (5:94f., no. 27)
16.03 (3:3f.)	*20.174A (5:90f., no. 25) ¹
17.289 (4:192)	*20.216 (5:108f., no. 35) ¹
17.292 (4:188)	20.237 (5:103, no. 31). ²
17.385 (4:194)	

b. *Edict*:

17.334 (4:54f.).³

¹These texts are discussed following the list.

²Possibly also **4:196f. (17.78). The sender is a certain Ebina'e, who is probably an official of the Carchemish court, mentioned in 3:7:19, and the parallel text 4:188:16. But the text exhibits a number of peculiarities: e.g., the verb form *ti-sap-pa-ra* l.7, which recurs in *PRU* 3:15:15, probably from Khatti; the form *mi-ik-sû-su* l.14, with a case-vowel before the suffix, a common feature of the U texts (see below, p. 223), but rare in K (below, p. 49). Forms from this text will be cited in the notes, where appropriate.

³This text is a replacement copy of an earlier, broken document (cf. ll.20ff.). It begins *umma šarrim-ma* "Thus (says) the king," and then sets out the proper action the king of Ugarit should take in the current war with a third party, and the rewards for the king of Ugarit if such action is taken. Thus, the text resembles a letter in form, but is in fact a record of official foreign policy. As such, it does not fit with any of the other text types.

c. *Treaties* (T):⁴

17.146 (4:154ff.)	18.19 (4:160)
17.230 (4:153f.)	18.115 (4:158ff.).

d. *Legal (Juridical) Texts* (J):

17.59 (4:150f.)	17.317 (4:178f.)
17.68 (4:164)	17.337 (4:168f.)
17.108 (4:165f.)	17.341 (4:161ff.)
17.110 (4:178a)	17.346 (4:176f.)
17.128 (4:179)	17.352 (4:121f.)
17.129 (4:166ff.)	17.355 (4:209f.)
17.145 (4:172f.)	17.396 (4:127f.)
17.158 (4:169ff.)	18.19 (4:160)
17.226 (4:208)	19.55 (4:293)
17.234 (4:173f.)	27.051+19.63 (6:36, no. 35) ⁵
*17.314 (4:189) ⁶	27.052 (6:37, no. 36). ⁷
17.316 (4:190b)	1957.1 (<i>AnOr</i> 48:11f.). ⁷

Three texts, the letters *5:90f. and *5:108f., and the legal record *4:189, have been included in the corpus even though their Carchemish origin is not absolutely certain. The sender of both letters is called simply "the king" (*umma šarrim-ma*). Addressed to the king of Ugarit, this could refer only to either the king of Carchemish or the Hittite emperor. But the latter is always specifically identified when he sends a letter (for example, *PRU* 4:35ff.; 4:103ff.; 4:188f.), whereas the former refers to himself

⁴C. Kühne, in his "Analytische Liste," *UF* 6, 132, refers to the content of these as "Staatsrechtliches."

⁵Cf. 4:292f.

⁶This text is discussed following the list.

⁷Possibly also **4:171f. (17.42), which is closely parallel to, and perhaps a copy of a personal record of, the case described in 4:169ff. Forms from this text will be cited only in the notes. Note also the tiny fragment **4:190a. (17.449), perhaps a duplicate of *4:189.

merely as "the king" in other letters (4:193; 5:103f.). Thus, *5:90f. and *5:108f. are to be included here. Further, the content and style of these letters matches other K letters extremely closely.

Text *4:189 is a legal case argued before a certain Armaziti, a "son of the king," who also appears in 4:188:9, a text that is definitely from Carchemish. H. Klengel⁸ and M. Liverani⁹ are both convinced that Armaziti is a son of the king of Carchemish. However, there is some room for doubt after their arguments. More significantly, a number of features in this text are peculiar vis-à-vis the rest of K: for example, the use of the pret. for a prohibition in 11.19,20; the inverted word order in 11.26ff.; the Assyrian statives in 11.6,8. The text is *probably* K, but it must be used with caution.

Several other texts, which Kühne in his "analytische Liste"¹⁰ marks as possibly of Carchemish origin, have not been included among the texts upon which the following study is based. Some have been omitted because they are mere fragments which contain little or no indication of

⁸Horst Klengel, *Geschichte Syriens im 2. Jahrtausend v.u.Z., Teil 2: Mittel- und Sudsyrien* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1969), 389.

⁹M. Liverani, "Karkemiš nei testi di Ugarit," *RSO* 35, 143.

¹⁰UF 6, 129ff.

of their place of origin.¹¹ Others, while more or less complete, again contain no evidence as to where they were written, being concerned, not with members of the Carchemish court, but with private citizens. The grammar of these texts is often at considerable variance with that of texts certainly from Carchemish (for example, unusual word order). They are *PRU* 4:109f. (17.28);¹² 4:182ff. (17.319);¹³ 4:236a (17.248); 4:236f. (17.251); 4:238 (17.231).¹⁴

¹¹*PRU* 3:6a (13.7B); 3:44f. (16.273); 4:108 (18.114); 4:123f. (17.362); 4:124 (17.367); 4:128 (17.348); 4:232ff. (17.252); 4:237f. (17.66); 6:59f. (no. 58; 17.243).

¹²This text also has two verbs with the WS pl. ending -ūna, attested in none of the texts from Carchemish or Ugarit: *in-na-am-mi-ru-na* and *i-ṣa-ba-tu_x(TU)-na*, both in 1.21.

¹³As Nougayrol notes, one of the witnesses in this text has the same name *and* filiation as a witness in the U text 6:39f. (no. 38; 17.355). The grammar too, besides the word order, is closer to U: e.g., *yānu* in 1.7; *irtēhi* in 1.8; see below, pp. 259, 302f.

¹⁴This text is listed by Kühne as possibly from Carchemish presumably because the PN *Tabrammi*, whose name occurs twice (11.8,15) is also found in the K text 4:168f.: 2,12,13,22. However, this is not enough evidence to include the text in our corpus. The grammar more closely resembles that of U.

B. NOTES ON ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

a. Logograms are only sparingly used, and exhibit few unusual features; see also the next section.

b. Logograms for metals are occasionally followed by MEŠ. It is unlikely that the determinative indicates plurality in such cases. The modifier is sg., e.g., in KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ (*kaspi/a*) ša-a-šu "that silver" 4:176f.:13,20.¹⁵ Also, in the same text, KÙ.BABBAR is used interchangeably with and without MEŠ: e.g., 4 li-im KÙ.BABBAR 1.4, but with MEŠ in 1.11,15; 4 GUN KÙ.BABBAR 1.24, but with MEŠ in 1.26; cf. also 5:94f., where KÙ.BABBAR occurs seven times without the determinative,¹⁶ but once with it (1.33). The logogram GUŠKIN (*hurāṣu* "gold") occurs three times without MEŠ,¹⁷ but with it in 4:209:4. URUDU (*erû* "copper") is followed by MEŠ twice (4:167:11; 4:209:6), but not in 4:127:6. UD.KA.BAR (=ZABAR, *siṣarru* "bronze") occurs five times, always with MEŠ.¹⁸ On other words, MEŠ probably always signifies that the word is pl.; at least, unlike U (see below, 172ff), there is no evidence to the contrary.

¹⁵Cf. KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ ŠĀM.MEŠ-šu-nu 1a(?) -a(?) na-din(?) 4:293b:7f. If correctly restored, the sentence means: "The silver of their price(s) has not been given"; i.e., the verb is sg.

¹⁶Lines 8,10,12,15,16,18,26.

¹⁷4:121:8; 4:127:6; 4:151:17.

¹⁸4:127:7; 4:167:11,21; 4:179:5,6. In all, MEŠ occurs on logograms for metals 28 times, is lacking 33 times.

c. In a small number of instances, an extra vowel-sign appears at the beginning of a verb. This feature is common in OB with the G dur., and the D dur. and pret., of verbs I-',¹⁹ but disappears in MB.²⁰ Verbs I-' make up most of the examples in K as well: e.g., *i-ir-ru-bu* 4:54:12; *e-el-li AnOr*48:12:14;²¹ but there are also instances with other verbs and tenses: *u-ut-te-er* 4:208:5;²² *i-iṣ-bā-at* *4:189:5. Most verbs do not exhibit this feature, including almost as many verbs I-' as do show it.²³

d. Only one verb form occurs in which the final root consonant is written double:²⁴ *i-šak-kān-nu-ni-ik-ku* 3:7:23.

¹⁹GAG §23d.

²⁰J. Aro, *Studien zur Mittelbabylonischen Grammatik, Studia Orientalia XX* (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1955), 21f. (hereafter: *SMbG*).

²¹Other examples are cited below, p.68.

²²This feature is very common at Boghazkoy, but still almost invariably with verbs I-' (and I-w); cf. Durham, "BoAkk" 11. It is also found at Alalakh, most often with verbs I-', but, as in K, also with other verbs; cf. G. Giacumakis, *The Akkadian of Alalakh* (Paris: Mouton, 1970), §8.21, p. 55 (hereafter: *AkkAL*). At Alalakh, all but one example are in the third person. It must be remembered, however, that 1s verbs are not nearly as frequent in either corpus. The occurrence of this feature in Nuzi is discussed by G. Wilhelm in *UF* 3 (1971), 285ff.

²³E.g., *e-pa-aš* (Ass.) 4:192:16; *i-mar* *ibid.*:10; *im-ma-ru* 4:153:14.

²⁴Apart from verbs II-w/y and II-', where such doubling is expected before vocalic endings (*GAG* §104f), e.g., *ut-te-er-ru* 4:173:11. The phenomenon is also attested in only one strong verb in U; see below, 175. At Alalakh, too, only one example occurs; see Giacumakis, *AkkAL* §8.23, p. 56. For Boghazkoy, cf. Durham, "BoAkk," 379f.; elsewhere, cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 73ff.

The parallel text, 4:188:21, has *i-šak-ka-nu-ni-ik-ku*. The doubling of the final radical is probably not a phonological feature (e.g., shift of stress²⁵), but a graphic one. The scribe writes the "basic" form of the verb (*išakkan*), and appends an ending to it (here, the 3mp morpheme, and a pronominal suffix), the writing of which acts in part as a phonetic complement, much as is found in writings of the type *KUR-ti* for *māti*. In other words, *i-šak-kān* should be seen almost as a syllabic logogram: *I-ŠAK-KĀN-nu-ni-ik-ku=išakkanūnikku*.²⁶

e. There remain a number of unexpected, and inexplicable, doublings of consonants in the script, the phonological value of which is not clear:²⁷ *te₄-em-mi-i* (if correctly interpreted, for *ṭēmi*, with extra final vowel-sign as well) 3:8:26; and writings of *sākinu* "prefect": *LÚ sà-ki-in-nu* 4:166:8; 6:36:4; *LÚ sà-ki-in-ni* *ibid.*:2; but *LÚ sà-ki-nu* 4:162:7'; 4:176f.; 2,3,14.²⁸

²⁵So GAG §20g.

²⁶Similarly *I-DIN-nam* for *iddinam*, often in OB (e.g., xxiv:rl7; vs. GAG §102h); cf. *tal-ta-kān*^{an} 4:122:13. This interpretation was suggested by W.L. Moran. Cf. also S. Lieberman, *Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 45, n. 121; Durham, "BoAkk," 379f. The forms *it-ta-an-nu* 4:174:13' and *it-tan-na-mi* 5:94:15 exhibit the M/NB assimilation of *d* to the following *n* (cf. GAG §102 l).

²⁷Perhaps due to, or influenced by, Hittite Akk. scribal practice, where it is more common; cf. Durham, "BoAkk," 380ff. The forms *ša-nu-ut-ti-šu* 4:55:23 and *IR-ut-ti* 4:165:8 are Ass.

²⁸Note also *LÚ sà-ak-ki-ni* **4:196:2. See the remarks of H.M. Kümmel, "Ugaritica Hethitica," *UF* 1 (1969), 160.

f. There are a few forms in which an unexpected extra vowel-sign appears: e.g., *sa-a-ku* (*saku*) 6:37:16; *û-ta-a-ar-ra-šu-nu-ti* (*utarraššunūti*) 4:55:15;²⁹ *te₄-em-mi-i* (*tēmi*) 3:8:26.

g. There are no examples of broken writings (i.e., of the type **par-is* or **mu-ru-iš*) in K.

h. Numerous forms have an *e*-vowel where Bab. would have an *i*. Many of these could be Ass. forms. However, if the difference between *e* and *i* is discounted, there are very few examples that are Ass. on other grounds in K (see below, 91f). And certain forms with an unexpected *e*-vowel cannot be Ass.: *e-ep-pu-uš* 4:54f.:18; *e-ep-pūš-mi* 4:163:35' (Ass. *eppaš*; Bab. *ippeš*, *ippuš*); *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ} 4:54f.:17 (Ass. has *w* (OA) or *b* (MA) rather than *m*;³⁰ Bab. *amāti*). In some texts, forms with *e* stand alongside others with *i*: Ass. *e-er-ri-šu* 4:54f.:13, but Bab. *i-ir-ru-bu* *ibid.*:12 (cf. also 11.17,18, just cited); *e-el-li* *AnOr*48:11f.:14, but Bab. *i-ta-bā-ak-ši*

²⁹Cf. *i-ta-a-ar* for *itār* in the same text, 1.19.

³⁰Cf. GAG §21d. In CAD A/2, 29ff., under *amatu* and *bēl amati*, there are only three occurrences of *a-ma-(a-)te* in non-WPA texts: one from Susa (*MDP* 18:214:16; cited p. 40b); two from late Ass. royal inscriptions (*OIP* 2:108:vi:85; Streck, *Asb.* 12: i 128; both cited p. 42a). The rest of the occurrences of this writing (almost invariably followed by *MEŠ*) are found in texts from Amarna, Boghazkoy, Nuzi, and Ugarit. Clearly, then, *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ} is not an Ass. form. It is quite odd that, throughout the texts from Ras Shamra, *amātu* and *unūtu* are always written with *-te* in the oblique pl., while very few other words ever are.

ibid.:8,11;³¹ *û-nu-te*^{MEŠ} *an-nu-ti* 4:167:14; etc. Note also the following contrast: Ass. *ze-e-su* 4:122:27, but Bab. *dî-i-ku* 4:170:9,21; 4:174:6'; *ir-te-eh-mi* 5:94:17, but *[i]r-ti-ih* 4:166:9; *ir-ti-hu* 4:128:12; 4:208:11.³² Apart from *eppuš* and *amāte* above, it is of course possible to account for the forms with *e* as Assyrianisms. But since there are in fact so few of those otherwise, it is much more likely that the writers of these texts simply did not distinguish between the writing of *e* and *i*. Most of the forms would be written as normal Bab., since most of them would have been learned by rote. This proposal would also account for the anomalous *eppuš* and *amāte*. The same phenomenon is encountered in U, and is discussed more fully there; see below, 177ff.

Note: all verb forms will be transliterated and normalized with the prime vowel of the sign with which they are written, when there are different signs *CE* and *CI* (e.g., *ir-ti-hu*: *irtîhû*; but *ir-te-eh*: *irtēh*).³³ When a sign is normally both *CE* and *CI*, the normal Akk. form will be given

³¹Note that all other forms in the text are Bab., when there is a distinction: *ut-te-er-ši* l.9 (Ass. *uta''erši*); *i-ger-re* l.23 (Ass. *igarre*); *an-nu-û* l.23 (Ass. *annû*); *i-le-'-e-su* l.24 (Ass. *ila''ēšu*).

³²*irtēh* is not a specifically Ass. form; AHw, 979a, shows that forms of *rāhu* with medial *ē* occur in many dialects. The *e* is due to the following *h* (GAG §9h). The point here is that both *irtēh* and *irtîh* occur.

³³Occasionally, for clarity, the correct Bab. form will be given: e.g., *te-te-nē-pūš-šu* for *tētenepuššu*.

(e.g., *i-le-eq-qu-û*: *ileqqû*). Most non-verbal forms will be cited in the normal Akk. form, to facilitate reference and comparison.

i. In over a dozen examples of D and Š pret., perf., and prec. forms, there are only two in which the MB assimilation of *a* to *e* (before *i* in the following syllable) has taken place:³⁴ *um-te-eš-še-er* 4:150:5 and *um-te-el-lu-û* (by analogy with unattested **umtelli*) 4:172f.:13. A few of the forms without this assimilation are: *li-ma-al-lu-mi* in the same text as the last example, l.9; *um-tal-lu-û* 5:95:54; *ul-tal-li-mi* ibid.:21,27; *li-pa-ah-hi-ir-ma-a-mi* 4:163:21',27'.

j. *ia* has become *â* throughout:³⁵ e.g., *an-na-a-ti* (from *anniâtîm*) 4:169:19; *[ta-p]a-an-na-ni-šu-mi* (from **tapanniannî-šû-mi*) 4:54:7; *lu-tam-ma-a-mi* (from **lutammiam-mi*) 3:8:16. No forms that would have had *ea* in OB occur.

k. Initial *w* has been lost: cf. *a-ši-ib-mi* 6:37:10, and other forms of (*w*)*ašābu*, cited below, p. 70. Intervocalic *w* is written *m*: *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ} 4:55:7; *û-maš-ša-ru-ka* *5:109:10.

l. Mimation has been lost word-finally throughout: e.g., on nouns: ^{LÜ}*a-sî-ru an-nu-û* 3:8:27; *ma-mi-ti* 5:95:52; *nap-ša-ta* 3:8:20; on verbs: *il-la-ka* 4:193:8; *û-ma-al-lu-ni*

³⁴Cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 40ff.; no participles of D or Š are attested in K.

³⁵Cf. *GAG* §161,k.

4:156f.:35; on dative suffixes: *il-la-ka-ak-ku* *5:109:rl2'.

It continues to appear unambiguously (i.e., with final sign

VM only in a few fixed noun expressions, such as: [*išt*]u

UD.1.KAM *an-ni-i-im* "from this day" 4:190:1 (but cf. *ištu*

UD-*mi an-ni-i* 4:122:26); *ur-ra-am še-ra-am* "in future", e.g.,

4:164:7.³⁶ That these are fixed phrases suggests that they

are archaisms, and that the final *-m* was never pronounced.³⁷

This further implies that all final *CVM* signs are to be read

as *CV_w*.³⁸ Mimation is preserved, however, when it is not

final, and it assimilates to the following consonant: e.g.,

ša-ni-im/nim-ma 4:163:25',29'; *il-la-ka-ak-ku* 4:192:8; *ú-ma-*

al-lu-nim-ma 4:156f.:44.

³⁶This occurs five other times, always with mimation: 4:166a:9; 4:167:20; 4:168:13; 4:-28a:12; 6:37:17. In U texts, it is found both with and without mimation; see below, p. 187

³⁷Swaim's conclusion in "AkkUg", 27, that such forms indicate sporadic mimation, is linguistically implausible. The variation, which he finds troublesome, and "hardly... a matter of historic spelling" in fact does indicate precisely the tension between learned (or historic) forms (i.e., with mimation), and the actual pronunciation.

³⁸E.g., *TUM* in *mu-tu₄ nap-ša-tu₄* 3:8:20. Further evidence that *-tu₄* is to be read is found in *L₆.MES šī-bu-tu₄-ia* 5:94:27, cf. *l.25*; *i-ša-ba-tu₄-ni* 4:155:9; in these, *-tum* is not possible. Another frequent *CVM* at the end of words is *LIM*, which must be read *lī*: e.g., *É.GAL-lī-šu* (gen.) *AnOr*48:12:11,19. With one exception, *LIM* occurs word-finally only as a phonetic complement to logograms (e.g., *L₆*, *URU*, *É.GAL*), vs., e.g., *É ki-lī* in 6:36:6. This suggests that its use was learned as part of the "paradigms" of these logograms, and, therefore, that the "paradigms," and thus the entire writing system, were first borrowed when the final *-m* was still pronounced, i.e., in the OB period. The exception mentioned above occurs in 4:176:4: (PN) 4000 *kaspa ana ha-la!-lī(?) ilteqē-mi* "PN has taken 4000 silver in stealth(?)" (see below, 156). Note that *LIM* is only rarely used for final *-lī* in MB; cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 24.

m. With the exception of the preposition *ištu*, which is always written *iš-tu*, the change of *š* to *l*, which occurs sporadically already in late OB,³⁹ always takes place in K: e.g., *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 4:194:8; *il-tāk-nu* 4:192:14; *al-ta-ri-iq-mi* 4:179:8; *ri-kīl-ta* 4:154ff.:4,47,48.

n. When a root-final dental or sibilant comes in contact with *š* of the third person pronominal suffixes, only once does the expected change to *-ss-* take place:⁴⁰ *DAM-šu* (i.e., *aššassu*) *AnOr*48f.:7.⁴¹ The other attested forms are: *NIN(ahāt)-šu* *ibid.*:10,18; *qa-at-šu* 4:166:5,7; *İR(arad)-šu* 4:163:33'; *mu-ut-ši* 5:95:41,46; *SAG.DU(qaqqad)-šu-nu* 4:154:18; *te-te-ni-pūš-šu* 4:193:12

o. The verb *sanāqu* is always written with *š* as the first radical in K: *iš-ni-qu* 4:168:4, and often; *na-aš-ša-ni-iq-mi* 4:176:7. The final radical of *rakāsu* alternates between *s* and *š*: *ir-ku-us* 4:154ff.:5,47, but *ir-ku-uš* 4:163:3 (note *ri-ik-ša* "treaty" in the same line); in 4:160:2', read with Nougayrol probably [*ir-ku*]-*uš*. With both these verbs, it is more likely that phonological confusion is involved rather than orthographic, since signs for *s* and *š* are elsewhere always correctly distinguished. The word *sākīnu* "prefect" is always written with *sā* (ZA), showing the WS form of the word:

³⁹Cf. *GAG* §30g; Aro, *SMbG*, 37f.

⁴⁰Cf. *GAG* §30f.

⁴¹In **4:179:9, note *aṭ-ru-us-ṣā* (from **aṭrud-šu*).

e.g., 4:161:7'; 4:176:2,3,14.

p. Nasalization of a voiced double stop, a sporadic feature of MB,⁴² takes place occasionally in K as well: *ma-an-da-ti* 4:154ff.:6,28; 4:159:20; *i-ma-an-gur* 4:167:18, but *i-ma-g[ur]* 6:37:14. The dur. of *nadānu* never shows nasalization: e.g., [t]a-na-din-ma-a 5:103:r4'.

The changes *mt→nd* and *nk→ng* do not occur:⁴³ *um-tal-lu-ú* 5:95:54; *um-te-eš-še-er* 4:150:5; *kān-ku* 4:177:14,18.

⁴²Aro, *SMbG*, 35ff.

⁴³Evidence for other, similar changes (cf. Aro, *SMbG* 38f.) is not attested.

C. MORPHOLOGY

1. Personal Pronouns

a. Independent.

These are poorly attested in K. Only nom. forms occur, and only part of the paradigm. Third person forms are listed below, 35f, under the anaphoric pronoun.

1s: *a-na-ku* 4:54:5; [a]-n[a]-ku(?) 5:94:10.

2ms: *at-tā* 4:54:6; *at-ta* 4:193:9,17; *5:109:12;

at-ta-a(?) (broken context) *ibid.*:17.

lp: *nē-e-nu* 4:169:9',11',17'.

If *i* and *e* were distinct in this dialect (an unlikely situation, see above, 24f.), *nēnu* would be Ass.⁴⁴

b. The emphatic gen. pronoun *attu-* occurs twice. It serves as the predicate in 4:163:3'f.: *šumma at-tu-ni hapīrū...* "The Hapiru...are not ours."⁴⁵ The other attestation is in a broken context: *lat-tu-ia* 4:178:7'.

c. Genitive Suffixes.

1s: *ŠEŠ-ia* (acc.) 6:37:5, (nom.) 7; *ZI-ia* (acc.) 3:8:

22;⁴⁶ *i-na tup-pt-ia* 4:168:5; *it-ti-ia* 3:3:7;

at-tu-ia 4:178:7'; *LÚ.MEŠš-i-bu-tu₄-ia* 5:95:22;

İR.MEŠ-ia (nom.) 4:168:7; [ZA]G.MEŠ-*ia* (acc.)

⁴⁴Cf. *ni-i-nu* in a U text (*3:19:24).

⁴⁵This line is discussed in more detail below, pp. 97f. For *attu-* used as a predicate, cf. CAD A/2, 513 (*attu*, 2 a).

⁴⁶Note also *LÚ-ia* (acc.) in **4:196:8.

*5:90:9; etc.

The writing of this suffix with the *IA*-sign even when the allomorph *-ī* is expected (as with *ZI-ia*), also occurs in U. Since there are more examples there, discussion is deferred until later (p.193). ŠEŠ-*ia* is for *ahūya* (nom.) and *ahāya* (acc.) in MB.⁴⁷

2ms: *a-na muh-hi-ka* 3:3:4, and *p.*; ZAG.MEŠ-*ka* 3:6:7; etc.

3ms: once *-su*: DAM(*aššas*)-*sū* (acc.) *AnOr*48:11:7; otherwise *-šu*: e.g., NIN(*ahāt*)-*šu* (acc.) *ibid.*: 10,18; *qa-at-šu* 4:166f.:5,7; GĪŠ_{se20}-*er-di-šu* *ibid.*:15; LÚ.MEŠ₃-*bi-bu-tu₄-šu* 5:95:25; rarely *-šū*: e.g., ĪR(*arad*)-*šū* (nom.) 4:163:33'; ŠEŠ(*ahū*)-*šū* 4:193:19 (but HA.LA-*šu* *ibid.*:10,22).⁴⁸

3fs: once *-ša*: *it-ti-ša* *AnOr*48:12:15; otherwise always *-ši*: ŠEŠ-*ši* *ibid.*:15; LÚ_{mu-ut}-*ši* (acc.) 5: 95:41,46; GĪD.DA(*mūrakī*)-*ši* 4:194:12; DUMU-*ši* 4: 208:6; GEME₂.MEŠ-*ši* ĪR.MEŠ-*ši* UDU.HI.A-*ši* 4:209: 10f.⁴⁹

Note that the only occurrence of the correct form of the suffix, *-ša*, is immediately preceded by a word with *-ši* (*AnOr*48:12:15). The almost complete dominance of *-ši* is

⁴⁷Cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 67.

⁴⁸Cf. *ha-ši-ih-ta-šū* (acc.) **4:196:10.

⁴⁹In *5:109:15, it is unclear whether *qa-qa-ri-š[ā]* or *qa-qa-ri š[ā]* is to be read.

undoubtedly a levelling through of the acc. suffix (see the following section).⁵⁰

- 1p: *at-tu-ni* 4:162:3'; *KUR-ni* 4:173:3'; etc.
 3mp: SAG.DU(*qaqqad*)-*šu-nu* (acc.) 4:154:18; ŠÀ-*šu-nu* 3:7b:11; *a-šar-šu-nu-ma-a-mi* 3:7a:15; *aš-ra-šu-nu-ma* 4:188:11; LÚ.MEŠ *da-i-ku-šu-nu* 4:155:8; *ú-nu-te*^{MEŠ}-*šu-nu* *ibid.*:10; etc.
 3fp: ŠÀ-*bi-šu-nu* 4:168:9, referring to ZI.MEŠ (*nap-šātu*).⁵¹

d. Accusative Suffixes.

- 1s: [*ta-pla-an-na-ni-šu-mi*]⁵² 4:54:7; *im-tā-ah-ra-ni* *5:90:7; *im-tah-ra-a[n]-ni* 5:95:35.

The form of the suffix is Bab. -*anni* (i.e., -*ni* preceded by the ventive morpheme -*am*).

- 2ms: [KÚ]R-*ru*(*liṣṣurū*)-*ka* 3:6:6; *ú-maš-ša-ru-ka* *5:109:10.
 3ms: *i-du-ku-šu* 4:153:7,13; [*il-ta-kān-šu-mi* 6:36:6;

⁵⁰The suggestion of Giacumakis, *AkkA* §4.16, p. 33, that the gen. suffix -*ši* is due to Canaanite influence is unfounded, for the only 3fs pronoun in Canaanite with an *i*-vowel is the independent form **hiya* (Hebrew *hî*). The suffix form was presumably always *-*ha* (becoming *-*ah* in some dialects).

⁵¹The sentence is: *šar GN 7 napšāti ina libbīšunu 3 amīlū 4 sinniṣātu...ittadin* "The king of GN gave 7 'souls' --among them 3 men and 4 women" 4:168:8f. -*šunu* may be m. because of the following *amīlū*. But, strictly speaking, -*šina* is expected, referring to f. *napšāti*; perhaps this is one of several examples showing a lack of fp morphological categories; see below, p. 109.

⁵²On this form, see below, p. 34, and n. 57.

il-te-e-šu 4:178:5; *aš-ša-bat-šu-mi* 6:37:9;
 etc.; rarely *-šū*: *ip-ta-ṭar-šū* 3:7:10.⁵³
 3fs: always *-ši*: *ut-ta-ki-ra-aš-ši*⁵⁴ *5:109:16;
i-le-'-e-ši 4:208:10; *i-ta-bā-ak-ši* AnOr48:11:8;
 etc.

The 3fs acc. suffix has been levelled through as the gen. suffix as well (see above).

3mp: once *-šunu*: *at-[t]a-ši-šū(?) -nu* 3:8:26;
 otherwise always *-šunūti*: e.g., *ū-na-ak-kār-šū-nu-ti* 4:188:4; *ū-ta-a-ar-ra-šū-nu-ti* 4:55:16;
tu-ul-te-el-li-šū-nu-ti 4:122:11; etc.⁵⁵

Thus, Bab. *-šunūti* is the normal form of this suffix in K.

e. Dative Suffixes.

Few examples occur apart from the 2ms, which, apart from the 1s, is the only dat. sg. suffix to exhibit a formal distinction from its acc. counterpart, since mimation has been lost (see above, 26f.).

1s: *id-nam-mi* 4:168:7; *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11.

The suffix always has the form of the ventive, never the acc. *-anni*, as occasionally in U (see below, 200f).

⁵³Cf. also *aṭ-ru-us-šū* in **4:196:9, the only form with acc. or dat. suffix in which root-final dental or sibilant plus pronominal *-š* have become *-ss*.

⁵⁴Possibly dat.; the context is broken.

⁵⁵Other occurrences are 3:7:18; 4:168:6; 4:122:26.

2ms: *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 4:194:8; *il-la-ka-ak-ku* *5:109:
r12'; *il-la-ku-ni-ik-ku* 3:7:21; etc.

The distinction between acc. *-ka* and dat. *-ku* is maintained throughout the K texts. Moreover, the dat. suffix is always preceded by the ventive morpheme, whereas the acc. is not used with the ventive in any of the few extant examples.

3ms: *li-šal-lim-šu*⁵⁶ 5:95:34; *it-ta-di-in/din-šu* 4:
167:9,17; [*ta-p*]a-an-na-ni-šu-mi "you precede me
to him" 4:54:7.

Note that in *tapannānni-šum-mi*, the acc. suffix precedes the dat., contrary to normal Akk. usage.⁵⁷

2. Other Pronouns

a. The Anaphoric Pronoun.

In all dialects of Akk. the third person independent pronouns are formally (and undoubtedly etymologically) identical to the forms of the anaphoric (or "far demonstrative") pronoun.⁵⁸ Thus, all forms of both are given here

⁵⁶*-šu* may be an acc. suffix, in which case *šullumu* would govern a double acc. here: "to repay someone with something" (cf. GAG §145). However, the clause *x kaspā... ana PN ultallim-mi* in 5:94f.:13ff., 26f, would argue that the second object of the verb is indirect: "to pay something to someone." A further example is found in 4:170:16ff.; cf. also AHw, 1145a (*šalāmu* D 7).

⁵⁷GAG §§42e, 84h; in a Hattite text, the form occurs without the dat. suffix: *ta-pa-an-na-a-an-ni-ma* PRU 4:36:37.

⁵⁸Cf. GAG §41b.

for comparison, although, by coincidence, all the personal forms are nom., all the demonstrative forms gen. or acc. (In the following, dem.=demonstrative, pers.=personal; with the former, ms, etc. refer to the noun modified.)

ms dem.: gen.-acc.: ša ^{L1}DAM.GÀR ša-a-šu 4:170:13;
KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ⁵⁹ ša-a-šu 4:177:13,20; KÙ.
BABBAR [šā]-[a⁷]-šu⁶⁰ 5:94:13.

pers.: nom.: šu-ū 4:176f.:18,20; šu-mi ibid.:12,16,
17; šu-ū-ut 4:166:14; 4:193:20,21.

fs dem.: gen.-acc.: mi-id-da-ti ša-a-ši 4:194:19f.;
[x⁷] MUNUS-TUM⁶¹ ša-a-ši 5:95:51; a-na MUNUS-ti
š[a-a-si(?)] ibid.:54; AN.ZA.KÀR⁶² ša-a-šu
4:162:3'.

mp dem.: gen.-acc.: ša ^{L1}.MEŠ DAM.GÀR ša-a-šu-nu 4:

⁵⁹MEŠ does not necessarily indicate plurality; see above, 21).

⁶⁰This restoration seems more likely than Nougayrol's [la-a](?) -šu, a form which does not occur anywhere else in the Ras Shamra texts. I would suggest the following for ll. 10ff.: u kaspu [šā] (Nougayrol: [anla) muhhi[š]u uttakhir-mi danniš [u] šar GN 400 kaspā [šā]šu mithāriš ana muhhi PN iltakan-mi "and the silver which he owed was much in arrears, so the king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN at the same time." The PN must still be seen as a scribal lapse, Takiya being intended rather than Mar-Zibaya. P.-R. Berger's proposed [DI]R-šu (VF 2, 286) makes little sense in the context.

⁶¹See below, p. 43, n. 87.

⁶²This form is listed here on the assumption that *dimtu* (AN.ZA.KÀR) is f. in the sg.; cf. CAD D, 144a. Although at Nuzi one finds *dimtu*...šā nadû (HSS 15:1:5,20), and *dimtu*...hepi (JEN 525:52ff.), it must be remembered that the m. often replaces the f. in the stative at Nuzi (Gordon, OrNS 7, 220).

156f.:24; ša LÚ.MEŠ DAM.GÀR šu-nu-ti ibid.:

39; ZAG.MEŠ-ka ša-a-šu-nu-[m]a 4:188:20.

pers.: nom.: šu-nu-mi 4:168:5.

fp dem.: gen.-acc.: aš-šum šu-un-na-ti⁶³ ša-a-šu-nu
4:208:7; ša KASKAL.MEŠ(harranāti)⁶⁴ ša-a-
šu-nu 4:176:8; ZI.MEŠ(napšāti) ša-a-šu-nu
4:173:2'.

The nom. forms šū (Bab.) and šūt (Ass.) both occur in legal texts from the reign of Ini-Teshub. Neither these few occurrences, nor the double occurrence of šūt in the letter 4:193, is enough to determine the typical or most frequent form of the 3ms nom. in K.

For the gen.-acc. case, the dat. form of the pronoun is normally used. Once, however, šunūti, the true gen.-acc. form (mp) occurs, in the same text and context as the formally dat. šāšunu. The only conclusion possible is that the two forms were interchangeable, but that the dat. was preferred. In one instance, (dimta šāšū) there is a (probable⁶⁵) lack of agreement, in which the m. pronoun is used with a f. noun. F. pl. nouns are apparently always modified by the m. pl. pronoun.⁶⁶

⁶³The verb here is *irtīhū*, i.e., 3mp in form, but probably serving as 3fp as well; see below, p. 109.

⁶⁴*harrānu* is usually f. in the sg., probably always so in the pl.; cf. the dictionaries, s.v.

⁶⁵See n. 62, above.

⁶⁶On the f. pl. in general in K, see below, p. 109.

b. The only demonstrative that occurs apart from the anaphoric pronoun (above) is the adjective *annû* "this." It is declined and used like all other adjectives; some examples: ms nom.: *asîru an-nu-û* 3:8:27; fs acc.: *rikîlta an-ni-ta* 4:157:47,48; mp gen.: *gabba unûte an-nu-ti* 4:167:14; fp gen.: *3 Ê.MEŠ an-na-a-ti* 4:169:19. No form of *annû* occurs as a (neuter) substantivized pronoun (i.e. "this thing").

c. There are no interrogative pronouns attested in K.⁶⁷

d. Indefinite Pronouns.⁶⁸

i. *personal*

Two forms occur: *mamma*, and the peripheral *mannum-mê*.⁶⁹ The former is found only in negative clauses: e.g. *ma-am-ma lû lā unakkaršunûti-mi* "No one may change them" 3:7:17f.; cf. 4:188:13f.;⁷⁰ in a negative oath (thus, without a negative adverb⁷¹): *šumma ana ma-am-ma amîli šanîm-ma...natta-din-mi* "We have not given to any other man" 4:163:25',29'.

⁶⁷A possible instance of *am-minî* "why?" is suggested below, 85, under *kîkî*.

⁶⁸All attested forms are cited here.

⁶⁹In texts found at Ras Shamra, this form also occurs in U (see below, 205), and those from Khatti (e.g., *PRU* 4: 65:r9'), Amurru (e.g., *PRU* 4:133:24'). Elsewhere, it is attested in texts from Alalakh, Boghazkoy, and Nuzi; cf. *Ahw*, 603b; *CAD* M/1, 218f.

⁷⁰Cf. also **4:197:12f.

⁷¹The form of the oath is discussed below, 160f.

As the examples show, *mamma* may stand independently, or as an attribute in apposition before a noun.

mannum-mê occurs once, with *ša*, meaning "anyone (who), whoever": *ma-an-nu-me-e ša rikilta annīta ušašnā DN₁...DN₆ lū bēlū māmītīšu* "As for anyone who would alter this treaty, may DN₁...DN₆ be the lords of his oath" 4:157:48ff. *mannum-mê* is apparently replaced by the impersonal *mīnum-mê* in appositional use (see below).

ii. *impersonal*

Again, there are two forms, with different uses: *mim-ma* and the peripheral *mīnum-mê*.⁷² Like *mamma*, *mimma* occurs in negative contexts: e.g., *mim-m[ā l]ā habbulākū-mi* "I owe nothing" 4:189:8. In this example, it is independent, and serves as the direct object.⁷³ In others where it is independent, it is an adverbial acc., meaning "(not) at all, in (no) way":⁷⁴ e.g., *RN mim-ma lū lā utarraššunūti* "RN is not obliged to return them at all" 4:54f.:14f.; cf. 4:192:17ff. Elsewhere, *mimma* stands in apposition after a noun,⁷⁵ and means "(not) any": e.g., *PN unūtēšu mi-im-ma [ša] tam-*

⁷²Also, in texts found at Ras Shamra, in U (see below, 208f), from Khatti (perhaps *PRU* *3:15:18); Amurru (*PRU* 3:13c:8). Elsewhere, it is attested in texts from Alalakh, Boghazkoy, Nuzi, and Amarna; cf. *AHw*, 656b; *CAD* M/2, 97f.

⁷³Cf. *CAD* M/2, 74f. (*mimma* a 2' a').

⁷⁴Cf. *CAD* M/2, 75a (*mimma* a 2' b').

⁷⁵Cf. *CAD* M/2, 77f. (*mimma* b 2').

kāri...ul ušēli "PN did not produce any utensils of the trader..." 4:170:7ff.; cf. 4:151:19f; 4:167:21ff. (Note that the personal *mamma* stands *before* a noun.) In one instance, the clause with *mimma* is not negative, but a protasis: (*šumma...*) *RN...dīna mim-ma igerre* "(if...) RN... starts any lawsuit" *AnOr*48:12:21ff.

mīnum-mê, like *mannum-mê*, is not used with negatives. It always stands in construct or apposition⁷⁶ before a noun. *mīnum-mê* and *ša* function together as a general relative in the following: *mi-nu-me-e ZAG.MEŠ-ka ša PN iškunakku ašar-šunū-ma lū šabtū* "Whatever borders of yours PN established for you must remain in their place" 4:188:8ff.; cf. the parallel 3:6:11ff.; *mi-nu-me-e ĪR.MEŠ...ša libbi GN₁ ašbū RN līpahher-mā-mi* "RN must gather whatever servants...are living in GN₁" 4:163:26'f. (Note that the pronoun is indeclinable, since it is acc. here.) But in a sentence with the same meaning as the last, *mīnum-mê* itself functions as the general relative:⁷⁷ *mi-nu-me-e ĪR.MEŠ...ina GN₂ ašbū šar GN₂ līpahher-mā-mi* *ibid.*:21'f. In these examples, the pronoun is in apposition to nouns denoting persons, apparently replacing *mannum-mê* in this function. In two other examples, no relative clause is present; in one, *mīnum-mê* is again an attributive: *mi-nu-me-e sinnišāti...amāti...[...]* *RN...ana*

⁷⁶The construction cannot be discerned morphologically, since the noun is always a logogram. In **4:196, both possibilities occur: *mi-nu-um-me-e šul-ma-ni* (bound) 11.6f.; but *mi-nu-um-me-e ha-ši-iḥ-ta-šū* (appos.; acc.) 11.10f.

⁷⁷Cf. a similar use of *mannum-mê* in U, p. 205f, and n. 144.

FN [...] *uttēr* "RN...returned to FN...all the women...the maidservants..." 4:209:9ff.; in the other, the pronoun must be in construct, and mean "everything": *mī-nu-me-e mārāt RN₁...ša ina libbī GN mārāt RN₁...ēpušu gabba ana RN₂... irttīhū* "Everything of the daughter of RN₁...which the daughter of RN₁...acquired in GN, belongs entirely to RN₂..." 4:127f.:5ff.

The phrase *mīmma šumšu* "everything" does not appear in K.⁷⁸

iii. The pronoun *mimmū* "any/everything of" occurs in K only with pronominal suffixes, and is indeclinable. The most felicitous translation of it is "possessions of." All examples of *mimmū* are given in the list in section g., on *gabbu*, which always precedes it.

iv. Finally, there is the form in *aia-nu-ma ša iddūkūšu nīdē-mī* "We do not know anyone who killed him" 5:95:49f. (the second clause of an oath after *šumma*). The form⁷⁹ should be normalized *ayyānum-ma* and seen as an extended form (with *-ān*) of the indefinite adjective *ayyum-ma* "whichever" (not attested in K).⁸⁰ Since *ayyānum-ma* is the direct object of *nīdē-mī*, it is apparently indeclinable, like *mī-num-mē*. Its use seems to parallel that of *mannum-mē*, al-

⁷⁸It does show up in U, however; see below, p. 211.

⁷⁹See *Ug.* 5, 95, n.4. For *IA=aia*, cf. Moran, "Syrian scribe," 150.

⁸⁰Cf. *GAG* §48h; *Ahw*, 26a; *CAD A/1*, 236b.

though the latter does not occur in any negative contexts, as *ayyānum-ma* does here.

e. *gabbu*.

Though formally a noun, "entirety," *gabbu* is regularly construed as a pronoun, "all, everything." It occurs only in legal and treaty texts, as follows:

1. NĪ.GU₄.MEŠ-šunu unūtēšunu *gab-ba* (acc.) 4:155:9f.
2. *sinnišāti...hurāṣa kaspā* [...] *gāb-ba* (acc.) 4:209:3ff.
3.] *imēru gab-bu mimmūšunu* (nom.) 4:159:32
4. *gāb-bā unūte annūti* (nom.) 4:167:19
5. *gāb-bā unūte annūti* (gen.) *ibid.*:14
6. *gāb-bā unūte annūti* (acc.) *ibid.*:17
7. *gāb-bā mīmma* (gen.) *ibid.*:22
8. *gāb-bi mimmūšu* (gen.) *ibid.*:16
9. *gāb-bā mimmūšunu* (gen.) 4:121:9
10. (*mīnum-mē mārāt RN₁...ša ina libbi GN mārāt RN₁...ēpušu*) [*g*] *gāb-bā ana RN₂...irtīhū* 4:128:11f.

When *gabbu* occurs after a series of nouns it is an independent, catch-all resumptive: "X, Y, Z, everything" (exx. 1,2). In such instances, it is probably a fully declined nomen rectus, deriving its case from the sentence.⁸¹ When it modifies another noun, it invariably stands before it.⁸² The nature of its form in such occurrences is prob-

⁸¹However, the two instances of this use, both acc., are not enough to make this certain.

⁸²In MB, and other dialects, it often follows the noun,

lematic, however. Apparently the scribes were not sure how to construct phrases with it. And with only one example in which a declinable noun follows (repeated, exx. 4-6),⁸³ and that example probably a frozen form,⁸⁴ it is impossible to determine whether it was construed as a bound form, or in apposition to the following noun. Two points argue for the latter option, however: (a) the verb in 4 is pl., indicating that the subject is *unūte annūti* (albeit in the wrong case; see above and n. 84); (b) *gabba* would be a unique bound form. The most likely solution is that there were alternate forms of the pronoun in the scribes' minds, one fully declined (as in exx. 3,8), the other simply *gabba*, indeclinable (as in exx. 4-7,9).⁸⁵

In ex. 10, *gabba* is an adverbial acc.; the sentence should be translated: "Everything of *m.*, which *m.* acquired (lit.: made) in GN, belongs *entirely* to RN₂..."

3. The Noun and Adjective

a. Declension of the Unbound Form.

i. In most of the examples, the case-endings are cor-

frequently in the frozen form *gabbī-*, with a suffix, as in *tamertu gabbīša* "the whole plain," cited in Aro, *SMbG*, 64; cf. also GAG §134i; *AHw*, 272a (*gabbu* I 2d).

⁸³Otherwise, only indeclinable *mimmū* follows.

⁸⁴Note that it is identical for all three cases.

⁸⁵Perhaps on the analogy of *mamma*, *mimma*.

rectly supplied.⁸⁶ However, there are a significant number of scribal errors. A list of nouns and adjectives in K texts shows seven mistakes in 48 forms in the letters, and seven mistakes in 91 forms in the remaining texts. That the latter have only half as many errors (in per cent) is explained by the fact that they are much more formulaic and repetitive, and contain more expressions which the scribes would have learned by rote. The errors follow no observable pattern, except that many of them are probably due to confused or confusing syntax. The cases most often mixed up are the nom. and acc.⁸⁷ A few typical errors follow.

acc. for nom.: *mu-ul-la-a akannā-ma* "The fine is the same" 4:154:23(T), as though a verb (e.g., *umallūni* "they will pay") should follow, as in 4:156f.:27,34, 43 (also T).

tup-pa kân-ku "the sealed tablet" 4: 177:14,18 (both times nom.); perhaps influenced by the (correctly) acc. *tuppa kanka* in 11.10,12, although

⁸⁶On *e* vs. *i* in the gen., see above, 24.

⁸⁷The wrong vowel occurs for the gen. only once, in a letter: *⌈x⌋* MUNUS-*tug ša-a-ši* 5:95:51. The gen. *sinništi* is almost certainly intended. Nougayrol reads *TUM* as *tīm*, but this value occurs nowhere else in texts from Ras Shamra; AS³ (no. 137) lists it as a rare value, found only in OB and OA. MUNUS.*TUM* should probably be understood as a compound logogram, analogous to *LÚ.LUM* in the U text 3:54:12, 14. This is rendered somewhat less likely, however, by the appearance of MUNUS-*tī š[a-a-ši(?)]* (gen.) in 1.54. The possibility that the form is in fact nom. is mooted below, 45.

In 3:3:5, Nougayrol reads *ša LÚ.MEŠSA.GAZ-ru(?)*, but the copy suggests that *⌈-ri⌋* is equally possible. The two "Winkelhakens" preceding it are the end of the *GAZ* sign.

this does not explain the disparity between the noun and the adjective, which is correctly marked.

û-nu-te^{MES}-*šu-nu* 4:154ff.:41; presumably because the word is nearly always in an oblique case, elsewhere in the corpus.⁸⁸
*nom. for acc.: mu-ul-lu*⁸⁹...*mārû GN ušallamûni* "The citizens of GN will pay a fine..." 4:154ff.:23ff. The only apparent explanation is that the object (*mullu*) is quite far removed from the verb. Perhaps the scribe initially intended *eli mārî GN* "(the citizens) will owe" as predicate. But *mu-ul-la-a ušallamûni* occurs in the same text, 11:27,34,43.

1 du-u-du₄ siparra iltariq-mi "he stole 1 bronze kettle" 4:179:6.⁹⁰

⁸⁸E.g., in the same text, 11.10,16,18,32, and p. elsewhere. Yet, in the same text again, in a parallel line, we find *û-nu-tu*^{MES}-*šu-nu* (nom.) 1.25. In both cases, the verb is sg. (*ihallîq*). Another incorrect nom. of *unûtu* occurs in 4:167:19: *gâb-bâ û-nu-te*^{MES} *an-nu-ti*. That *unûte annûti* is gen. after *gabba* is unlikely; cf. above, p. 41f.

⁸⁹The defective writing of the final vowel (for *mullû*) is also unusual.

⁹⁰When a noun is modified by the material of which it is made, two constructions are possible: (a) the noun denoting the material is in apposition to the main noun, in the same case (*GAG* §134 f β); (b) the main noun is in the bound form before the material-noun in the gen. (*GAG* §136h). Both constructions are found in K; note: *û-nu-ut* UD.KA.BAR (nom.) 4:127:7, and *û-nu-te*^{MES} UD.KA.BAR (gen.) 4:167:21. It is impossible to determine which is intended here since *siparru* is a logogram, and *dûdu* could be a bound form (see below, 48f.). Neugayrol's proposal, to read *TUM* as *dâm*, is very unlikely; AS³ (no. 137) even questions the existence of such a value.

There are a number of peculiarities in examples of the expression *ina X qāt PN illi* "PN will forfeit X."⁹¹ Properly, *qātu* is the subject, as for example: *PN₁...lītmā-ma ša PN₂ ŠU līlī* "Let PN₁...swear, and PN₂ must renounce claim (lit.: the hand of PN₂ must go up)" 5:95:28ff.; cf. *ša mārī GN [SŪ-šu]-nu [līlī]* "The citizens of GN must renounce claim" 4:162:4'f. But the syntax becomes confused in the following: *PN ištu...kaspi qātšu ēteli* "PN has forfeited...the silver" 4:166:5, cf. 7. Here, either *PN* is a casus pendens: "as for PN, his hand has gone up"; or, the sense has been turned around (from the Akk. point of view), and *qātšu* must be seen as an adverbial acc.: "PN has gone up with regard to his hand." If the latter interpretation is correct, it would throw light on 5:95:51: *["x"] MUNUS.TUM šāšī qa-ta lī-i-["x"]* "That woman must renounce claim." Perhaps *MUNUS.TUM* is nom. after all,⁹² and *qāta* is an adverbial acc.⁹³ Finally, there is 3:8:28ff.: *šumma asīru annū... ilteqē-mi [š]a(?) PN qa-at*⁹⁴ *līlī-mi* "If this prisoner has taken..., ..." *CAD* and *AHw* both render the second clause:

⁹¹Cf. *CAD* E, 125 (e₁ū 3 b 3'); *AHw*, 208a (e₁ū IV G B 8 b-c).

⁹²See above, n. 87. If *MUNUS.TUM* is nom. *šāšī* would obviously be in the wrong case; *šī(t)* would be expected.

⁹³The matter must remain unresolved until the identity of the first and last signs here can be determined. Perhaps *qātā*, nom. dual, should be read.

⁹⁴I can find no explanation for the absolute state here.

"he shall not have any claim on PN."⁹⁵ However, when compared with the other examples above, especially 5:95:28ff. and 4:162:4'f., it is clear that the clause must be translated: "PN must renounce (any) claim."⁹⁶

ii. There are two instances in which the particle *umma* is followed by a syllabically written name; one is: *um-ma* ^I*a-li-he-eš-n[i]* 3:6b:1, i.e., in the gen., as elsewhere in WPA.⁹⁷ In *4:189:6, we have: *um-ma* ^I*pu-ū-uš-ku*, which appears to be nom.; however, this name is probably indeclinable, since the same form occurs for the acc. in 1.3.

iii. In 4:154ff., a peculiar alternation is found; note:

1. LÚ.MEŠ *da-i-ku-šū-nu iṣ-ṣa-ba-tu₄-mṭ* 1.8
2. *da-i-ku-šū-nu i-ṣa-ab-ba-tu₄-ni* 1.30
3. LÚ.MEŠ *da-i-ku-šū-nu la-a iṣ-ṣa-[b]a-tu₄* 1.36
- but 4. *da-i-ku-ti-šū-nu la-a i-ṣa-ba-tu₄-ni* 1.20
5. LÚ.MEŠ *da-i-ku-ti-šū-nu ni-de-mṭ* 1.23.

It is possible to construe all the verbs in exx. 1-3 as N duratives, the one in ex. 4 as a G. If that is the

⁹⁵For references, see n. 91, above; AHW has: "er verliere den Anspruch auf PN." Nougayrol renders: "que PN s'en porte garant!"

⁹⁶In *tēm tuppi annī ku-tal-li itār* "The stipulations of this tablet become void" 4:55:19f., it is possible that *kutallī* is an adverbial acc. (pl.); however, a more likely solution is that <ana> has been omitted. Cf. CAD K, 605b (*kutallu* mng. 4).

⁹⁷See R. Marcus, JCS 2, 223f.

case, the paradigm of this noun (with suffix) is: nom.: *dāikūšunu*; acc.: *dāikūtīšunu*. I can find no reason for this odd phenomenon. The presence or absence of the determinative complex *LÚ.MEŠ* seems to follow no pattern.⁹⁸

iv. In *5:91:14, the writing *i-na ZAG.MEŠ-ni* probably indicates an extended pl. in *-ān* (cf. *GAG* §61i), i.e., *pāṭānī[šū(?)]*.⁹⁹

v. One possible occurrence of the locative-adverbial ending is: *kī-it-tu₄ altariq-mi* "In truth (or: truly) I stole (them)" 4:179:8. However, it is also possible that the form is nom.: "(It is) the truth; I stole (them)."¹⁰⁰ Otherwise, locative *-u(m)* occurs only in the frozen adverbial form *ašrānu*; see below, 84, s.v.

vi. The terminative-adverbial ending *-iš* occurs only in three frozen adverbial forms: *danniš*, *mithāriš*, and *ṭābiš*; see below, 84ff, s.v.

b. The Bound form before Nouns.

The following are all the syllabically written examples:

⁹⁸Cf. also *LÚ.MEŠ* *da<i(?)>-ku-ti-šū-nu* 4:159:21.

⁹⁹So also Nougayrol's normalization. Although this pl. is not attested elsewhere for *pāṭu* (*AHw*, 851 f.), it makes little sense in the context to take *-ni* as a lp suffix, as P.-R. Berger does (*UF* 2, 286). (*L.12* should still be read *[a]-dī-ni* with Nougayrol, vs. Berger, *ibid.*)

¹⁰⁰So *AHw*, 494b (*kittu(m)* 2 d); cf. *CAD* K, 472b (*kittu* 2 d).

Sg.: *te₄-em tuppi* (nom.) 4:55:19; *ištu le-et PN* 4:165:6; *ina hu!-ud libbīšunu* 3:7:11; *aššum di-ni sin-ništi* 5:95:40; *ištu ša a-ba-a-bi šarri* 4:55:20; *ana muh-hi PN* 5:94:8, and *p.*; *ina ŠĀ-bi GN* 4:155f.:7,29.

Pl.: *be!-lu māmītīšū* 4:157:53; *pu-hi ardīya* (acc.) 4:168:7; *ana pa-ni ahhī* 4:157:39; cf. 4:179:7
*ū-nu-ut siparri*¹⁰¹ 4:127:7.

The only example not in accord with regular OB and MB formation of the bound form before nouns is the fourth (*dīni*),¹⁰² the bound form is almost invariably *dīn*.¹⁰³ Here perhaps *dīni* is analogous to the alternate bound form exhibited by other nouns of the type *pūs*, e.g., *qāti*.¹⁰⁴

c. The Bound form with Suffixes.

Nouns in the gen. (sg. and pl.) with suffixes exhibit no peculiarities whatsoever.¹⁰⁵ Thus, only nom. and acc. forms are listed below:

¹⁰¹On this construction, see above, p. 44, n. 90.

¹⁰²Cf. *GAG* §64; Aro, *SMbG*, 66f.; for *gabbu* before nouns, see above, 41f.

¹⁰³*CAD* D, 150ff., gives only one example in which the gen. bound form is *dīni* (p. 152b, citing Borger, *Esarh.* 82 r 20, i.e., a SB royal inscription), beside many examples of *dīn*.

¹⁰⁴Cf. *GAG* §64c, and Anm.

¹⁰⁵E.g., sg. *ina tup-pī-ia* 4:168:5; pl. *qadu LÚ.MEŠ* *ti-bu-ti-šu* 5:95:28,32. The form *ŠEŠ(?) -e-ka* 3:4:10 is probably gen., but the context is broken.

- Sg.: LŮ_{mu-ut-šī} (acc.) 5:95:41,46; *a-šar-šu-nu-ma-a-mī*
 (acc.) 3:7a:15; *aš-ra-šu-nu-ma* (acc.) 4:188:11;
qa-at-šu (acc.?(/nom.?) 4:166:5,7, 0
- Pl.: LŮ.MEŠ_{šī-bu-tu₄-ia/-šu} (nom.) 5:94f.:22,25; *dī-*
nī-šu (acc.)¹⁰⁶ *ibid.*:37; (LŮ.MEŠ) *da-i-ku-šu-nu*¹⁰⁷
 (nom.) 4:155f.:8,30,36; (LŮ.MEŠ) *da-i-ku-ti-šu-nu*¹⁰⁷
 (acc.) *ibid.*:20,23; *ū-nu-tu*^{MEŠ}-*šu-nu* (nom.) *ibid.*:
 25; *ū-nu-te*^{MEŠ}-*šu-nu* (nom.)¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*:41, (acc.)
 1.10; cf. 4:170:7.

Only the third example (*ašrašunū-ma*) requires further comment; from the viewpoint of native Akk., it is incorrect in that the suffix is attached not to the bound form, but to the noun with a case-vowel.¹⁰⁹ The correct form occurs in the previous example, which is found in exactly the same context.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶The sentence is: *inanna di-ni-šu ša-al-ma*, which Nougayrol renders: "maintenant: son affaire est reglée." However, better sense is afforded if the verb is taken as an imper. of *ša'ālu* (see below, p. 69, n. 171), in which instance *dī-ni-šu* is acc. Although the pl. of *dīnu* seems most often to be f. (i.e., *dīnātu*) in the Ras Shamra texts, AHw, 171b, notes that it can also be m.

¹⁰⁷See above, 46f.

¹⁰⁸See above, 42.

¹⁰⁹In **4:196f., note also *ha-šī-ih-ta-šū* (acc.) 1.10, and *mī-ik-sū-šu* (acc.) 1.14. The latter is another example of a case-vowel before the suffix, albeit an incorrect one (Ass. vowel harmony?). *hašīhtašu* could be another such example; however, the form is also correct in native Akk.

¹¹⁰3:6f.:9-16=4:188:8-12; the only other difference between the two passages is the addition of *-mī* in 3:7a:15.

If the forms above are typical of the K dialect, it must be concluded that proper Akk. forms predominated. Whether *ašrašunū-ma* is to be considered simply a scribal error, or whether it represents an underlying (WS?) dialect, in which pronominal suffixes were regularly placed after the case-vowel (i.e., a dialect in which bound forms retained case-endings),¹¹¹ cannot be determined on the basis of only one form. In U, a case-ending in the bound form predominates; see below, pp. 219ff.

d. The Absolute State.

With one exception, only numerals occur in the absolute state in K: e.g., *1-en* (i.e., *īstēn*) *5:90:10; *5:108:6; *me-at* 4:160:5', 9', and *p.*; *li-im* 4:166:8, and often. The exception is *qa-at* in 3:8:29, quoted above, p. 45.

e. There are no occurrences of the predicative state of the noun (e.g., *šarrāku*). The stative is treated under the morphology of the verb.¹¹²

¹¹¹This is the case with all WS dialects. The feature is preserved in Ugaritic (see below, p. 224, n. 214). For classical Arabic, cf. Wright, *GAL*, I, §316, p. 251. In Hebrew and Aramaic, diachronic reconstruction reveals that the feature was present at earlier stages of the languages, before all short final vowels were lost; e.g., in Hebrew, the vowels before suffixes reflect the case-endings homophonous with the original vowels of the suffixes (T.O. Lambdin): e.g., on *kōl* "all": 2ms *kullāk* (Michah 2:12) <**kulla-kā* (acc.); 2fs: *kullēk* (Isaiah 14:29) <**kulli-kī* (gen.); 3ms: *kullōh* (Isaiah 15:3) <**kullu-hū* (nom.); 3fs: *kullāh* (Isaiah 48:6) <**kulla-hā* (acc.).

¹¹²See the discussion in the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

4. The Verb

a. The Markers of Person.

i. imperative

Only the ms occurs (thus, with Ø-marker for person);

e.g.:

G: [š]u-ku-un-šu *5:109:r14'; a-lik ibid.:r6';

id-nam-mi 4:168:7.

D: te-er-ra-aš-šu-nu-ti 4:168:6.

Š: šu-ši-ir 4:192:15.

ii. durative, preterite, perfect

The ls prefix in the G is a-: e.g., ap-r[u-u]s 3:7:11, or, with Bab. vowel harmony, e-: e.g., e-qè-er-re-bu 4:54:

6. A prefix i- never occurs, as is sometimes the case in letters in the Amarna tablets.¹¹³ In the Š, the sole form has u-: ul-te-bi-lak-ku 4:194:8. No ls D or N forms occur.

The prefix of the second person (only 2ms occurs) in the G is normally ta-: e.g., ta-ta-na-din-ma (Gtn) 4:193:16; with Bab. vowel harmony, te-: e.g., te-qè-re-e[b] *5:91:15. As in most dialects, ti- is found with the verb edû: e.g., ti-i-de_q-šu 4:193:18.¹¹⁴ No N, D, or Š forms occur.

¹¹³Cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 54f. edû is not attested for ls.

¹¹⁴Cf. GAG §106q; AHw, 187f. ti- as prefix for the second person is common at Alalakh; cf. Giacomakis, *AkkA* §8.21, p. 57. It is also found in one text that is possibly K, **4:196:7: te-ma ti-šap-pa-ra "Send me news." Nougayrol divided the words after -ti, i.e., tēmāti šappara. This, however, creates two unusual forms, for the pl. of tēma is m., and the imper. of šapāru is šupur (šupra with ventive).

In the 3ms and 3mp, the only non-MB feature is that the prefix of verbs I-' is sometimes written *e*, as in Ass., rather than *i*: e.g., *e-er-ri-šu* 4:54:13 (but *i-ir-ru-bu* ibid.:12. These forms are discussed above, 24f. There are no third person forms with *y*- prefix, and no 3mp forms with *t*- prefix, or with the ending *-ūna*.

The following are all the occurrences of the 3fs:¹¹⁵

FN...it-ta-ra-aš 4:167:17;
ša FN...ū-ka-[a]l-lu 4:208:3;
ša...mārat RN...e-pu-šu 4:127:9f.;
mārat RN...lā i-ra-gu-um 4:128:13ff.;
FN...lā i-ra-gu-um 4:210:17;
*lā e-el-li AnOr*48:12:14;
*šarrat GN...ti-it-ta-din-ma...tu-ul-te-el-li-
 šu-nu-ti u...ta-al-ta-kān^{an}* 4:121f.:7ff.

Thus, the form of the 3fs in K is normally identical to the 3ms. It differs from the latter in only one text (but there consistently), where it has a *t*- prefix. The

Even if taken as a unique D of *šapāru*, the imper would be *šuppīra* (or *šappīra* in Ass.). It is likewise an improbable WS form. Perhaps pretonic reduction (i.e., **təšappara*) is indicated. Note that the same expression and form occur in *PRU* 3:15:15, probably from Khatti.

¹¹⁵Several others are possible or even probable: [*adi nukurtu*(?)...] *iggamar* 4:151:6; *FN*[...] *gabba ša ina* [...] *ul-te-ri-ib* 4:209:2ff.; and three grammatically difficult passages involving the idiom *qātu X illi*, in which *qātu* (f.) should be the subject (see above, 45f.): 3:8:29 (*li-i-li-mi*); 4:166:5,7 (*e-te-li*); 4:162:4'f. (*li-i-li*). The idiom also occurs in 5:95:30,51 (*li-(i-)li*), but there it is not certain that *qātu* is the subject. Note that in all these instances, the verb has the same form as the 3ms.

t- occurs with three vowels; that of *tultellīšunūti* presents no problem, but what is the difference, if any, between the *a* and *i* in *taltakan* and *tittadin-ma*? No solution seems obvious.¹¹⁶

First pl. verbs are the following:

L: *ni-id-du₄-ku* 5:95:48; *ni-i-de₄-mi* *ibid.*:50.

T/J: *ni-de-mi* 4:156:23; *ni-de₄-mi* 4:162f.:10';

ni-de₄-e-mi *ibid.*:20'; *na-ak-ki-is-mi* *ibid.*:9';

cf. 1.12; *na-at-ta-na-din-mi* *ibid.*:18';

na-at-ta-din-mi *ibid.*:25',29'; *na-at-ta-kir-mi*

ibid.:24',25',29'; *na-aš-ša-ni-iq-mi*¹¹⁷ 4:176:7.

Unfortunately, since these examples come from only four texts, and only two (from the same text) are from letters, few conclusions can be drawn with certainty. If they are typical, it would appear that in the letters, the lp prefix was *ni-*, whereas elsewhere, apart from the verb *edû*, it was *na-*. The latter prefix is non-Akk., and its origin must be sought in some substrate language, presumably a WS dialect.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶Since the forms are perfects rather than preterites, the prefixes cannot be examined on the basis of the Barth-Ginsberg rule (i.e. *yaqtul* and *yaqtīl*, but *yīqtal*).

¹¹⁷On this form, see below, pp. 66f.

¹¹⁸If the forms in the treaties and legal texts are due to WS influence, note that *nakkis-mi* follows the Barth-Ginsberg rule. Further, *nīde* could also represent an

3mp verbs are discussed with 3ms, above.

The only verbal clause with a f. pl. subject is: *ana šar GN ir-ti-hu* "they remain with the king of GN" (referring to *šdu-un-na-ti šāšunu* "those fortified estates") 4: 208:11. Although both the modifying pronoun and the verb are m. in form, the noun is probably f. pl.; *šāšunu* is used with other f. pl. nouns.¹¹⁹ Thus, the 3mp of the verb, like *šāšunu*, seems to have supplanted its f. counterpart.¹²⁰

iii. precative

Bab. forms are used throughout: e.g., 1s: *lu-tam-ma-a-mi* "let me adjure" 3:8:15; *li-iq-bi* "let him say" *ibid.*: 16; *li-šal-li-mu* "let them pay" 4:170:15. No 3fs forms occur.¹²¹ Also, no examples of the 1p injunctive are found.

underlying WS form, in which case it too might be following the same rule, provided an original **yadit^c* had already become (**yada^c*+) **yida^c*. But this seems less likely than simply considering *nīde* to be a form the scribes learned well, since the verb is so common.

¹¹⁹See above, p. 36.

¹²⁰This is true of the perfect (i.e., *qāṭal*) form in Hebrew as well. On the f. pl. in general, see below, p. 109.

¹²¹An inanimate 3fs may occur if *qātu* is the subject in [*š*]a PN *qa-at-li-li-i-mi* "let PN renounce claim (lit.: let the hand of PN go up)" 3:8:29 (and cf. 5:96:30; 4:162:5'). However, the syntax of this idiom may be confused in K; see above, pp. 45f.

iv. *stative*¹²²

The personal suffixes of the stative present no problems. Only two forms occur that are not third person; both are Ass.: 1s: *ha-bu-la-ku-mi* *4:189:8; 2ms: *ha-bu-la-tā-mi* *ibid.*:6. One other D is found; it is the same verb, but Bab. 3ms: *hu-ub-bu-ul(-mi)* 5:94:10,20.

All other statives are G; examples of strong verbs are: 3ms: *ša-li-im* 4:177:19,25; 3fs: *šal-ma-at* 5:95:26; 3mp: *ša-aṭ-ru-mi* 4:168:6.¹²³

b. The Ventive.

The ventive occurs without mimation, except when not final, in which case the *m* assimilates to the following consonant.¹²⁴ After sg. verbs,¹²⁵ it is *-a(m)*: *il-la-ka* 4:193:8; *il-la-ka-ak-ku* 4:192:8; after pl. verbs, it is *-ni(m)*:¹²⁶ *ū-ma-al-lu-ni* 4:156f.:36; *ū-ma-al-lu-nim-ma* *ibid.*:44.

There are differences in the use of the ventive that depend on the text genre. In the letters, it is quite consistently employed to indicate motion to a point

¹²²The treatment of the stative in this study is discussed in the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

¹²³The form *ša-al-ma* (5:95:38) is probably an imper. of *ša'ālu*, not a 3fp stative of *šalāmu*; see below, 69, n. 171.

¹²⁴Mimation in general is discussed above, pp. 26f.

¹²⁵Neither 2fs nor 1p forms occur with the ventive.

¹²⁶Never *-ne*, as in M/NA.

near the speaker. As such, it frequently denotes the 1s dat., and always occurs with the verbs *šapāru* and *šūbulu*: e.g., *tāš-pu-ra* "you sent/wrote to me" 3:3:6, and p.; *šu-bi-la* "send to me" 4:191:11; *it-tan-na-mi* "he gave to me" 5:94:15. Since the speaker places himself in the company of the addressee, motion toward the latter is also indicated by the ventive: e.g., *il-la-ka* "he is coming (here, where you are)" 4:193:8. It is this use that results in the occurrence of the ventive with the second person dat. suffix; in K, this happens without exception:¹²⁷ e.g., *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* "I (hereby) send to you" 4:194:8; *iš-ku-na-ak-ku* "he established for you" 3:7a:14.¹²⁸ Note that the ventive does not appear with the only example of a third person dat. suffix: *li-šal-lim-šu* "he must pay to him"¹²⁹ 5:95:34.

The ventive always precedes the 1s acc. suffix: e.g., *im-tah-ra-a[n]-ni* "he approached me" 5:95:35.¹³⁰ Otherwise, it occurs with an acc. suffix only once in 12 examples; unfortunately, the exception is in a broken context, and it

¹²⁷The lack of exceptions makes it equally possible that the scribes simply learned *-akku/-nikku* as the second person dat. suffixes.

¹²⁸Cf. also 3:6f.:10,21,23; 4:192:8. In 4:188:18, for Nougayrol's *al-tap-ra-aš[-šu(?)]*, read probably *al-tap-ra-a[k-ku]*. The copy, after RA, has ~~LA~~; cf. the AK in 7.10.

¹²⁹That the suffix here is dat. was argued above, p. 34, n. 56.

¹³⁰Other examples above, p. 32.

is even possible that the suffix is dat.: *ut-ta-ak-ki-ra-aš-ši* "he removed(?) her(?)" 5:103:16.

The reason for the occurrence of the ventive is obscure in only one other example in the letters: *arad PN lu-tam-ma-a-mi* (*lutammâm-mi*) "I will adjure PN's servant" 3:7f.:14f. Perhaps some nuance such as "here, in my presence," or even the 1s dat. ("I will make...swear to me"), is intended.

In the legal texts, very few examples of the ventive occur. In a number of cases, the nuance is that found in the letters: e.g., *te-er-ra-šu-nu-ti-mi...id-nam-mi* "return them to me...give to me" 4:168:6f.; *e-tap-ša-am-mi* "he made for me" 4:176:11. With a verb of motion, note: *it-ta-na-la-ku-ni[m]-ma-a-mi* "they keep coming here" 4:162:15'.¹³¹ In one instance, the ventive seems to serve no purpose: *šumma ina arki ūmi tuppa kanka...ū-še-la-a* "if in future he produces a sealed tablet..." 4:169:18ff.; cf. *šumma arki tuppi annī amīlī...ū-še-ēl-lu-ū* "if after this tablet (is completed) they produce men..." 4:163:30'.

In *4:189:18ff., the following clauses occur: *amīlu a[na amīlī] lā i-tū-ra māru ana māri lā i-tu-ur* "Man shall not return against man (for legal action); son shall not return against son." As will be seen below (151), the pro-

¹³¹But note that the next verb in this text, with the same implications of direction, does not have the ventive: *ina libbi mātīni ih-ta-nab-bā-tu-mi* "they keep making incursions into our land" 4:162:15; similarly, 77.19,20.

hibitive in K is regularly (*lū*) *lā* plus the dur. While *i-tū-ra* can be interpreted as a dur. (*iturra*), *i-tu-ur* cannot. Thus, the forms more likely reflect WS usage, where, in some dialects at least, the prohibitive is: negative adverb plus **yaqtul*.¹³² If this is in fact the case, perhaps *i-tū-ra* does not exhibit the ventive, but rather WS **yaqtula*, which is sometimes equivalent to **yaqtul*.¹³³

Two of the three treaty texts promulgated by Ini-Teshub, dealing with the murder of foreign merchants, are very similar in their format and content: 4:154ff. and 4:158ff.¹³⁴ It is possible the two were written by the same scribe. The use or non-use of the ventive in them is very peculiar vis-à-vis normal Akk. and the rest of K. First, it should be noted that the ventive appears only once on a sg. verb, and for no apparent reason: *ū-ša-aš-na-a* "(whoever) alters (this treaty)" 4:154ff.:49. On pl. verbs, it is rampant, but not predictable; it occurs on all exam-

¹³²For the Canaanizing dialect of the Byblos Amarna texts, see Moran, "Byblos," 49ff.; for Arabic, see Wright, *GAL*, II, §17b, p. 36; for Hebrew, note the occasional use of *'al* plus the short (jussive) imperfect form; cf. Joüon, *GHB*, §114i-j, pp. 310f.

¹³³E.g., in the Amarna letters from Byblos; cf. W.L. Moran, "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*," *OrNS* 29 (1960), 1ff.; Moran discusses the evidence of Hebrew and Arabic as well, pp. 12f.

¹³⁴In the other legible treaty, 4:153f., which is much shorter, and does not have the same format, the ventive does not appear at all, even though some of the same verbs occur: e.g., *i-ga-ab-ba-tu₄* l.8; *ū-ma-al-lu-ū* l.14. Text 4:160 is badly broken.

ples of *šullumu* (seven times¹³⁵), *mullû* (two¹³⁶), *alāku* (four¹³⁷), *qabû* (two¹³⁸), but on only some examples of *ṣabātu*,¹³⁹ *tamû*,¹⁴⁰ and *dāku*.¹⁴¹ For only one or two of these verbs--*alāku*; *qabû*(?)--could the ventive possibly have its normal function, for the verbs are all third person. It seems possible, therefore, since all the pl. verbs with the ventive in these two texts are dur., that the scribe(s) misunderstood its function, and associated it with the WS pl. imperfective morpheme *-ūna*. This hypothesis is supported by the following contrast: dur., always *i-tam-mu-ni* (4:154ff.:16,22,40), but prec. *li-it-mu-ū/-ma* 4:158ff.: 23,30. However, there are a number of problems with the proposal: (a) it is not certain the two texts, which each attest only one of these last forms, are by the same scribe; (b) the examples of the pl. dur. without *-ni* remain unexplained; (c) it seems unlikely that a scribe would use *-ni*

¹³⁵*ū-šal-la-mu-ni*: 4:154ff.:11,17,18,22,23; 4:158ff.: 18,25.

¹³⁶*ū-ma-aḷ-lu-ni*: 4:154ff.:35,44.

¹³⁷*il-la-ku-nim-ma*: 4:154ff.:21,37; 4:158ff.:7,14.

¹³⁸*i-qa-ab-bu-ni*: 4:154ff.:11,33.

¹³⁹With *-ni*: 4:154ff.:19,20,30; with no ending: 4:154ff.:36; 4:158ff.:13(?); further, twice with *-mi*: 4:154ff.:8; 4:158ff.:6. Some of these are quoted above, p. 46.

¹⁴⁰Cited below.

¹⁴¹*i-da-ku* 4:154ff.:29; *i-du-ku-mṯ* *ibid.*:8; *i-du-ku-ni* 4:158ff.:21. These are probably all N dur.; see below, p. 131, n. 368.

for his morpheme *-na*. Nevertheless, no other solution presents itself.

d. The Subjunctive.

The subjunctive *-u* occurs in K in over half the instances in which it is expected.¹⁴² The Ass. subjunctive particle *-ni* probably never occurs; all the forms with final *-ni* are plural, and so the ending should be taken as the ventive marker (see above) in those cases.

In the letters, the subjunctive is found on only one of the two verbs where it should appear; both verbs are in the same text: *ayyānum-ma*¹⁴³ *ša id-d[u_g]-ku-šu nīdē-mi* "We do not know anyone who killed him" 5:94f.49f. The other example is: *ša ana muhhīya hu-ub-bu-ul* "which was owed to me" *ibid.*:20.¹⁴⁴ Since *enūma* does not seem to be a conjunction in K,¹⁴⁵ the subjunctive is not found in the clauses which it begins.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴²I.e., on verbs in subordinate clauses, where such verbs are not already marked at word end by another morpheme (such as pl. *-ū/-ā*, the ventive, or the stative suffixes).

¹⁴³On this word, see above, p. 40.

¹⁴⁴On the basis of only two exx., it is impossible to determine whether this scribe considered that relative clauses did not require the subjunctive, or whether he was simply unfamiliar with the form in general; cf. also the next paragraph. In the letter **4:197:16f., the expected *-u* does not appear: *adi...a-ši-ib* "as long as he...resides."

¹⁴⁵See below, 140f. *enūma* occurs only in the letters.

¹⁴⁶Only one would show the *-u* if *enūma* were a conjunction: *enūma...at-[t]a-ši-šu-nu* 3:8:25f. Cf. also **4:196:8f.

The subjunctive is also found in an oath formula, in the same text as the above examples: *šumma mutši ša sin-ništi u ahi PN ina āli ni-id-du₄-ku* "We did not kill the woman's husband or PN's brother in the city" 5:95:45ff.^{146a} According to GAG §185g-i, the subjunctive in oaths introduced by *šumma* is an Ass. phenomenon (although there are very few Bab. examples to consider). However, by this period in Ass., we should expect the particle *-ni* to follow the form as well.¹⁴⁷ A further problem is that the next verb in a main clause, *ni-de₄-mi* (L.50), is governed by the same *šumma*, and is not subjunctive. It is noteworthy that the only two subjunctive forms in the letters occur in successive lines. Perhaps the second (*iddūkūšu*) influenced the form of the first, creating a scribal error.

In other types of texts, the subjunctive is more frequent. It occurs 11 times, but is lacking in nine other instances where it is also expected. A few examples with the subjunctive are: *ša tamkāri šāšu ša ina GN di-ī-ku* "of that trader who was killed in GN" 4:170:13f. (similarly in 22.8f., 20f.); *dunnāti...ša FN...ū-ka-[a]l-lu* "the fortified estates...which FN...holds" 4:208:2f.¹⁴⁸ Only one example is not a relative clause: *lām anāku ina GN e-qè-re-bu* "before I approach GN" 4:54:5f.

^{146a}This note appears on the following page.

¹⁴⁷GAG §83b.

¹⁴⁸Cf. also 4:54f.:10,18; 4:127:10; 4:153:7,13; 4:170:9,21; 4:176f.:15,18 (perhaps also 11,22, unless pl.); and cf. **4:171:5,13.

^{146a}Both A.F. Rainey (*IOS* 5, 24) and P.-R. Berger (*UF* 2, 287) have suggested reading instead: *šumma...ina alīni iddūkū* "(they)...were not killed in our city." The verb could thus be a G perf. 3mp impersonal (or perhaps even N pret.). Obviously, this is a much better reading grammatically. However, it is contextually impossible; it is the men of GN who are to swear this oath, and the text in *UL*.41f. says clearly that the two men *were* killed in GN. The purpose of the oath was not to deny the facts; rather, it was to deny that the men who took it either committed the crime themselves, or knew who had done it. An exact parallel to this type of double disclaimer is found in 4:162:9'f.: *šumma karānīšunu nēnu nakkis-mi u šumma amīlī ša karānīšunu ikkisū nīdē-mi* "We did not tear down their vineyards, nor do we know the men who tore down their vineyards." Thus, the difficult lp verb in 5:95:45 must remain.

Of the nine instances where an expected subjunctive does not occur, six are in the caveat: *ša iraggum tuppu annû ile''ēšu* "This tablet will defeat whoever brings suit."¹⁴⁹ The lack of the subjunctive ending in these cases is undoubtedly due to the great number of times *iraggum* occurs in other, non-subjunctive clauses. The scribes would simply have become accustomed to writing only this form.¹⁵⁰ The other three forms without *-u* where it should appear can only be explained as scribal lapses. One occurs after the conjunction *undû*¹⁵¹ "while, when": *un-[d]u šar GN ittīya ik-ki-ir*¹⁵² "when the king of GN was at war with me" 4:54:1f. The remaining two examples are in broken contexts, but it is fairly certain in each case that the verb is in a subordinate clause: *[adi(?) nukurtu ša] GN ig-gām-mar* "until(?) the war with GN is finished" 4:151:6; *gabba ša ina [...] ul-te-ri-ib* "everything which she brought into" 4:209:5f.

Finally, there is one case where the subjunctive may appear, incorrectly, in the protasis of a conditional sentence: *šumma ina arki ūmi RN ardīšu e-er-re-šu* "if in

¹⁴⁹4:168:26f.; 4:169:24f.; 4:161:24f.; 4:173:19f.; 4:179:16f.; 6:36:r4'f.; cf. also **4:172:21f.

¹⁵⁰Occasionally, *iraggum* is written even when the subject is pl.: e.g., 4:171:22ff.; see below, p. 107.

¹⁵¹See below, pp. 139f.

¹⁵²*[ir]* (so Nougayrol) appears in the copy to be more likely than *[ru]*, which would make the form subjunctive.

future RN demands his servants (back)" 4:54:12f. However, the form could just as easily be an incorrect pl. Another possible, though less likely, instance of the same ilk (4:163:30') is cited below, p. 108.¹⁵³

d. The Derived Conjugations.

Forms of the G occur *p.*, with no unusual features:

e.g., dur.: *i-dāb-bu-ub* (3ms) "he (may not) speak" *AnOr*48:12:15; pret.: *tāš-pu-ra* "you wrote to me" *p.* in the letters; perf.: *al-ta-ri-iq* (1s) "I stole" 4:179:8; etc. Only two problematic forms occur. One is the dur. *i-na-ah-sū* "(if) they shrink back (from the oath)" 5:95:53. It is much more likely that this is a scribal error, for *i-na-ah<-hi>-sū*, than a case of the syncopation of an entire syllable.¹⁵⁴ Second, the form written *ah-ta-bat-ma* in 4:54:7, which should be second person, is undoubtedly also a scribal error, for *tahabbat-ma*!.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³A similar phenomenon occurs in a U text: *6:3:27; see below, pp. 242f., n. 295.

¹⁵⁴Cf., in the same text, *i-na-ak-ki-ru* 1.31; elsewhere in K, note *i-na-ah-hi-sū* 4:162:6'.

¹⁵⁵The clause is: *šumma atta RN ah-ta-bat-m[a ta]pan-nānnīšum-mi* "If you, RN, attack and precede me to him"; thus, the form must be 2ms. Further, it is in the protasis of a conditional sentence, with reference to the future; in such cases, the verb is always dur. in K (see below, 131f.). Finally, note *ta-ha-bat-mi* in the next line, and also the parallel in a text from Khatti: *šumma atta RN [t]a-ha-bat-ma tapannānnī-ma PRU* 4:36:35ff.

i-da-ku in 4:156:29 is probably an N; see below, 131, n. 368. For *na-at-ta-kir-mi* in text 4:161ff., see the D, below.

The Gtn¹⁵⁶ dur. occurs in the following: *mārū GN₁ ana mārī GN₂ NĪ.KAŠ it-ta-na-di-nu-mi it-ta-na-la-ku-ni[m]-ma-a-mi ina libbi mātīni ih-ta-nab-bā-tu-mi* "The citizens of GN₁ keep giving beer(?) to the citizens of GN₂. They are constantly coming and making incursions into our country" 4:162f.:14'f., cf. 18'ff.; *[il]-ta-na-rī-iq-mi* "he kept stealing" 4:176:6. The form *im-ta-ha-[ṣu-m]i* in 4:162:4' in probably a Gtn pret. (*imtahhaṣū-mi*); why the Gtn was used here, instead of the G *im-ha-ṣu* as in the previous clause, is not clear.

Examples of the D are: *lū lā ū-na-ak-kār-ṣu-nu-ti-mi* "may not change them" 4:188:13f. (vs. *ta-na-ak-[ki]-ir* "you are hostile" 4:54:3f.; *lu-tam-ma-a-mi* "I will adjure (here?)" 3:7f.:14f. (vs. *li-it-ma-a-mi* "let him swear" *ibid.*:20f.)).¹⁵⁷ One troublesome form is *ut-ta-aḥ-hi-ir-mi*¹⁵⁸ "(the silver) is in arrears" 5:94:11; it is probably a D perf. The writing *utt-* rather than the expected *ūt-* is difficult to explain; perhaps it is due to Hittite Akk. influence.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁶The Gtn is probably the only one of the iterative (-tan-) conjugations that occurs; but see below, under Š.

¹⁵⁷Note that the only D's of verbs that are active-transitive in the G are *tummū* and *mullū*. The latter is used only with the restricted meaning "to pay in full" (cf. CAD M/2, 181ff.), and so only takes one direct object. In the only occurrence of *tummū*, the second object ("make someone swear something") has been deleted (cf. AHw, 1318a - *tamū* D 4).

¹⁵⁸Cf. AHw, 18a (*aḥāru*, D 2); note also CAD A/1, 170b.

¹⁵⁹Cf. Labat, *AkkBo*, 11; Durham "BoAkk," 381. It seems unlikely that UD has the value *u₄* here, since the value is attested nowhere else in K. However, AHw, 18b (*aḥāru*, D 3),

Another problem is the form *na-at-ta-kir-mi* in the following: *šumma arda amta ša RN nattak(k)ir-mi. u šumma ana amīli šanīm-ma ana šīmi nattadin-mi ū nattak(k)ir-mi* 4:163:24'f., cf. 28'f. Nougayrol translates the form in question: "nous n'avons pas distrait," but this is rather vague. When *nakāru* takes an acc., it means "to dispute something" or "to dispute with someone."¹⁶⁰ This is not the meaning here; the previous lines tell us that *RN*₁ must gather and return to *RN*₂ whatever servants of *RN*₂ live in the other's country; and the men of *RN*₁'s country must swear the above oath. Perhaps *nattak(k)ir* has a meaning for which the D is used elsewhere: "to take someone to another place."¹⁶¹ We could then translate: "We have not taken away (i.e., kidnapped) a male or female servant of *RN*₁, nor have we sold or taken away (a servant of *RN*) to anyone else." It is impossible to determine whether the form is a G perf. (*nattakir*), wrongly used with a D meaning, or a D perf. (*nattakkir*), with an incorrect prefix vowel.

In the Š, note, e.g., *ū-še-ēl-lu-ū* "(if) they produce (bring up)" 4:163:30' (vs. *lā e-el-lī* "she may not go up" *AnOr*48:12:13); *ul-te-ši-ib-ši* "I made her dwell" *AnOr*48:12:12 (vs. *ul aš-bu* "are not residing" 3:3:7, etc. with

lists OB *u₄-hu-ru*.

¹⁶⁰Cf. *AHw*, 719a, (*nakāru* G 6 c,d).

¹⁶¹*AHw*, 719b, (*nakāru* D 6).

verbs of motion.¹⁶² The only difficulty is *tu-ul-te-el-li-šu-nu-ti* in 4:122:11; if the form is a Š perf., as is most likely, then the double *-ll-* is incorrect (*tultēli* is expected). It is possible, however, that it is Štn pret., in which case the problem disappears.¹⁶³

For the use of the N, note: *šumma amīlu...id-da-a-ak* "if a man is killed" 4:153:4ff.¹⁶⁴ (vs. *šumma ša i-du-ku-šu iṣabbatū* "if they catch the one(s) who killed him" *ibid.*:7f. Note also [*adi(?) nukurtu...*] *iḡ-gām-mar* "until(?) the war ...is finished" 4:151:6.¹⁶⁵ An N perf. occurs in *it-ta-ah-na-a[q]*¹⁶⁶ "he hanged himself/was hanged" *5:109:11. A possible N form, but one which, unlike all other N's attested, does not seem to differ in meaning from the G, occurs in: *ana panī RN ana dīni na-aš-ša-ni-iq* "We went for a

¹⁶²E.g., *eḷū* 4:122:11; 4:159:28; 4:163:30; 4:169:20; *erēbu* 4:209:6. Other Š's are verbs of condition: e.g., *ešēru* 4:192:15; *šanū* 4:157:49. The only Š of a verb that is already transitive in the G is *šābulu* (4:194:8,11) which in the texts from Ras Shamra (and indeed probably in all WPA) means simply "to send," and does not take a double object, the first object (the person "caused to carry") always being deleted; cf. *CAD* A/1, 24ff. (*abālu* A, mng. 10).

¹⁶³Cf. *GAG*, p. 44*, paradigm 34a. If the form is in fact Štn, the other two verbs in the sequences of clauses in 4:121f.:7ff. (*ti-it-ta-din-ma, tal-ta-kān^{an}*) would be Gtn pret., rather than G perf. The Gtn (and, presumably, the Štn) sometimes has a distributive force (*GAG* §91f.), and there are two persons involved as objects here.

¹⁶⁴Other N's of *dāku* probably occur in 4:155f.:8,29; see below, p. 131, n. 368.

¹⁶⁵The N of *ṣabātu* probably occurs in 4:154:11; see above, 46f.

¹⁶⁶An Ntn pret. here seems unlikely.

legal case before RN" 4:176:7. If the verb is an N pret., it is the only occurrence of *s/šanāqu* in the N in the entire corpus; it is also the only lp example. The G, on the other hand, occurs in the third person p. in the legal texts, including the present one: *sākinu u PN ana dīni iš-ni-qu* *ibid.*:2. Perhaps the form should be emended to *na-aš-<<ša->>ni-iq*, a correct G pret.¹⁶⁷

There are no certain examples of the *t* (reciprocal) conjugations in K. However, note: *PN u amīlū GN ina birī-šunu im-tāg-ru* "PN and the men of GN agreed among themselves" 4:172:9f. Here the verb is probably Gt pret., rather than G perf.¹⁶⁸

e. Weak Verbs.

Almost all weak verbs are formed correctly, in typical MB fashion. A few examples of the various types follow.

i. verbs I-'₁₋₂

Examples of the G are:

dur.: *i-mar* 4:192:10; *perf.*: *i-ta-bā-ak-ši* *AnOr*48:

11:8, cf. 1.11; *stative*: *a-ri-ik* 4:194:13.

The only form that is not a G is the problematic D pret. *ut-ta-ah-hi-ir-mi* 5:94:11 (see above, p. 64). All

¹⁶⁷I.e., correct, given that the prefix of lp verbs in the legal texts is regularly *na-*; see above, p. 53. *AHw*, 1021b (*sanāqu* I B G 3), lists the form, without emendation, as G.

¹⁶⁸The form is listed as Gt in *AHw*, 576a.

the attested forms may be Bab. or Ass., assuming that *i* and *e* are not distinct in K (see above, 24ff.).

The forms of the irregular verb *alāku* that are attested are all G or Gtn:

G: dur.: *il-la-ka* 4:193:8; cf. 4:192:8; *5:109:r12';
il-la-ku 4:151:8; cf. 3:7:21; 4:156:21,37; 4:158:
 7,14; perf.: *it-ta* -[l]ak 3:4a:9; *it-tal-ku-mi*
 4:174:5'; imper.: *a-lik* 5:103:r6'

Gtn: dur.: *it-ta-na-la-ku-ni*[m]-ma-a-mi 4:162:15'.

It is possible that the G perf. forms listed above are Gt pret.'s; the context is not decisive in either case.

ii. verbs I-'₃₋₅

It was suggested in the phonology section (above, 24ff.), that there is no difference between *i* and *e* in K. On the basis of this, G forms which are Bab. are: dur.: *e-ep-pu-uš* 4:55:18; *e-ep-pūš-mi* 4:163:35'; perf.: *te* -te-pu-uš *5:109:13; cf. *5:90:11. Ass. forms are: dur.: *e-pa-aš* 4:192:16; perf.: *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11; *e-tap-šu-mi* ibid.:8. All other forms may be either Bab. or Ass.; e.g.:

dur.: *i-ir-ru-bu* 4:54:12; *e-er-ri-šu* ibid.:13;
 perf.: *e-te-li* (3f?s; Bab. *iteli*, Ass. *etili*) 4:
 4:166:5,7.

The Gtn dur. *te-te-né-pūš-šu* (2ms) 4:193:12,24, is a Bab. form (Ass. *tātanappaš*).

In the Š, all the forms are both Bab. and Ass.; e.g.:

dur.: *ú-še-ēl-lu-ú* 4:163:30'; pret.: *ú-še-li* 4:

170:9; perf.: *ul-te-ri-ib* 4:209:6.¹⁶⁹

The forms of *edû* "to know" are listed below, under verbs I-y.

iii. verbs II-¹⁷⁰

All the examples are G:

dur.: *i-le-'-e-šu* 4:166:13, and p. in legal texts;

perf.: *il-te-e-šu* 4:178:5; imper.: *ša-al-ma*¹⁷¹ 5:

95:38.

It is more likely that ' is lacking in the last two forms (i.e., *iltēšu*, *šāl-ma*), than that it is present, but not indicated; there is, however, no way to be certain.

Note that the first example is Bab. (Ass. *ila''e*); the

¹⁶⁹On *tu-ul-te-el-li-šu-nu-ti* in 4:122:11, see p. 66, and n. 163.

¹⁷⁰Verbs II-' in MB are discussed in Aro, *SMbG*, 74ff.

¹⁷¹The context is: *in[al]na di-ni-šu ša-al-ma mullā kt ša GN lu(-)ú-al-li-ni-šu*. The form of the last word remains difficult (see Nougayrol's n. 3); however, the second clause means: "they must pay the fine according to (the custom of) GN." Nougayrol takes the first verb from *šalāmu*, and translates: "maintenant son affaire est réglée." However, whether the verb were taken as f. pl. or m. sg. (with ventive), *dīntšu* would be in the wrong case. Moreover, in forms of *šalāmu* the closed syllable *šal* is always written with the *SAL* sign in K: e.g., *šal-ma-at*, *li-šal-li-im-šu* in the same text, 11.26,34. It is therefore preferable to take *ša-al-ma* as an imper. (plus *-ma*) of *ša'ālu*, and translate: "now, inquire about his case(s), so that they pay..." The sense also seems improved by this interpretation. *dīntšu* is thus acc. pl.; cf. above, p. 49, n. 106. (Note *ša-al-ma* "ask" also in *PRU* 3:11:13, a text of unknown origin.) A.F. Rainey *IOS* 5, 24, also takes the form from *ša'ālu*.

other two may be either.

iv. *verbs I-w*

In the G, the only prefix-conjugation form is the dur.
uṣ-ṣū-ma-a-mi (3mp) 4:162:18'. Otherwise, only (*w*)*ašābu*
 is attested: stative: *a-ši-ib* (3ms) 6:37:10;¹⁷² *aš-bu* (3mp)
 3:3f.:7,11; 4:163:22'26'; infin.: *a-ša-bi* 4:193:8. No
 forms with the original *w* occur.¹⁷³

One D form occurs; the intervocalic *w* is written *m*:¹⁷⁴
ū-maš-ša-ru-ka (dur.; 3ms) *5:109:10.

The following Š forms are attested:

perf.: *ul-te-ši-ib-ši* AnOr48:12:12; *ul-te-bi-lak-ku*
 4:194:8; imper.: *šu-bi-la* ibid.:11.

Thus, the Š in K, as in U (see below, 255), exhibits *e*-
 type forms.¹⁷⁵

In all cases in which there is a distinction between
 MB and MA forms, the I-*w* verbs are MB: *ašib*, *ašbū*, *ašābi*,
umaššarūka, *šūbila* (vs. MA *ušib*, *ušbū*, *ušābi*, *uššer*, *šēbila*).

¹⁷²Cf. also **4:197:17.

¹⁷³Cf. GAG §21c. In U, one such form is attested (*5:137:7); see below, p. 256.

¹⁷⁴Cf. GAG §21d.

¹⁷⁵I.e., *uššib*, rather than *ušāšib* or *ušūšib*; this appears to be the case for the most part in MB and in Ass. For the former, see Aro, *Glossar*, 5ff., s.v. (*w*)*abālu*, (*w*)*arādu*, (*w*)*ašū*, (*w*)*ašābu*; cf. also GAG §103v, where it is noted that *šūšubu* is an *a*-type in OB, but an *e*-type in MB and later (and in Oakk). For Ass., see Hecker, *GKT* §93g, pp. 157f.; Mayer, *UGMa*, 76f.; also GAG §103w.

v. verbs I-y

The only G verb is *edû*, which occurs only in the pret. ("preformative stative"), and is always written with *i* in the prefix: *ti-i-de₄-šu* (2ms) 4:193:18; *ni-de₄-mi* (1p) 5:95:50; cf. *ni-de-mî* 4:156:23.

One Š form is attested: *šu-ši-ir* (imper., ms) 4:192:15. The form is Bab. (vs. Ass. *šēšer*).

vi. verbs II-w

All the attested forms are:

G: dur.: *i-ta-a-ar* (3ms) 4:55:19; pret.: *i-tu-ur* 4:*4:189:20; *i-tû-ra*¹⁷⁶ *ibid.*:19; *i-du-ku* (3mp) 5:95:42; cf. 4:170:6; 4:153:7,13(3ms, subjn); perf.: *id-du₄-ku-šu* (3mp) 5:95:49; *ni-id-du₄-ku* (1p, subjn) *ibid.*:48; stative: *di-i-ku* (3ms, subjn) 4:170:21, cf. 1.9; 4:173:6'; 4:172:5(3mp); *se-e-zu* (3mp) 4:122:27.

D: dur.: *û-ta-ar-ši* (3ms) *AnOr*48:12:17,20; *û-ta-a-ar-ra-šu-nu-ti*¹⁷⁷ 4:55:15; *û-ka-[a]l-lu* (3fs, subjn); perf.: *ut-te-er* (3ms) 4:209:14; cf. 4:208:5; *AnOr* 48:11:9; *ut-te-er-ru* (3mp) 4:173:11; imper.: *te-er-ra-šu-nu-ti-mi* 4:168:6; prec.: *li-te-er-mi* 4:163:23',27'.

N: dur.: *id-da-a-ak* (3ms) 4:153f.:6,22; probably also

¹⁷⁶On the pret. forms, see above, pp. 57f.

¹⁷⁷On the extra vowel-sign, see above, p. 24.

i-du-ku-mě and *i-da-ku* (both 3mp) 4:155f.:8,29.¹⁷⁸

All of the forms that show a difference vis-à-vis Bab. and Ass. in the above are Bab.: *itâr*, *uttêr*, *utterrû*, *terraššunūtî-mi*, *litêr-mi*, and probably *iddâk* (vs. Ass. *itûar*, *utta''ir(û)*, *ta''era-*, *lita''er*, **iddûak*.¹⁷⁹

vii. verbs II-y

The following are all the attested forms; all are G:

pret.: *i-ri-ib* "he replaced(?)" 6:37:6;¹⁸⁰ perf.:

ir-te-eh (3ms) 5:95:17; *ilr-ti-iḥ* 4:166:9;

ir-ti-hu (3fp) 4:208:11.

viii. verbs third weak

The majority of these verbs require little comment.

The final vowel always assimilates to a following vocalic suffix,¹⁸¹ resulting in an ultra-long vowel, which is usually written *CV₁-V₁*, except when an additional ending follows.¹⁸² As examples, note: G: *iq-bi* (pret.; 3ms) 4:162:16', but *iq-bu-û* (3mp) *ibid.*:13', and *i-qa-ab-bu-ni* (dur.;

¹⁷⁸These forms are discussed below, p. 131, n. 368.

¹⁷⁹Not attested, but likely; cf. *GAG*, p. 35*, paradigm 28, n. 24.

¹⁸⁰This form occurs in a badly broken context. See A. F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 38.

¹⁸¹This is a distinctly Bab. feature; in Ass., the vowels generally remain uncontracted (*GAG* §16; cf. §105). Other examples of vowel contraction in K are cited above, p. 26.

¹⁸²Exceptions occur in both conditions, however: e.g., *ih-ta-ṭû* (*ih-taṭû*; G perf., 3mp) 4:121:6; *it-ma-a-mi* 4:166:4,6.

ventive) 4:155:11; similarly the following D dur. forms:
û-ma-ał-la (3ms) 4:153f.:9,12, but *û-ma-ał-lu-û* (3mp) *ibid.*:
 14,19, and *û-ma-ał-lu-ni* (ventive) 4:156:35.

The final vowel of the stative 3ms of *sakû* varies in the two examples encountered: *sa-ki* *4:189:26, but *sa-a-ku* 6:36:16.¹⁸³ One form of *tamû* appears to have a final *-i*, rather than the *-a* attested elsewhere: *it-t[a-m]i* (perf.; 3ms) 3:8:22,¹⁸⁴ but *it-ta-ma* 4:170:16; *i-tam-ma* (dur.) 4:177:23; *it-ma-a-mi* (pret.) 4:166:4,6.

Finally, it should be noted that the dur. of verbs III-*e* regularly has *e* between the first two radicals;¹⁸⁵ all the forms encountered are G: *i-ger-re* (3ms) *AnOr*48:12:23; *i-le-³-e-šu* 4:166:12, and p.; *[i-le³]-eq-qû-u* (3mp) 4:54:10.¹⁸⁶

5. Prepositions

a. Simple Prepositions.

adi: does not occur in K as a preposition.

¹⁸³Cf. *GAG* §105d,f. The alternation seems to be typical of this verb; cf. *CAD* Z, 25ff. In U, *saki* predominates; *sakû* is also found, but not *saku*; see below, 235.

¹⁸⁴The copy of this text, in *Mélanges...Dussaud* (op. cit., p. 1, n.2, above) is very bad; the sign in question looks like *[m]*¹, but Nougayrol read *[m]i(?)*. The form *li-it-mi-ma* 4:170:12, is most likely a scribal error, namely, a metathesis of the last two signs; cf., in the same text, *it-ta-ma* 4:166:12; note also *li-it-ma-mi* 4:172:6.

¹⁸⁵This is also a typically Bab. feature (vowel harmony); cf. *GAG* §105f. In U, forms with *a* (e.g., *ilaqqe*) occur at least as often as forms with *e*; see below, 181ff.

¹⁸⁶Cf. also *i-le-eq-qe* (3ms) **4:196:11.

am-minî "why?": perhaps in *5:90:11; see below under *kîkî*.

ana "to, for": always written *a-na*. It is attested with most of its normal Akk. nuances: e.g., dative: *ana PN it-tadin* "he gave to PN" 4:178:9; *ana PN umtallû* "they paid to PN" 5:95:54; and *p.*; in expressions of price:¹⁸⁷ *ana 200 kaspi iptataršu* "he ransomed him for 200 silver" 4:165:7; cf. 3:7:9f.; *ana šîmî* "for a price" 4:163:25', 29'; with infinitives: e.g., *ana tummî* "to swear" 4:167:18. It is quite rare, however, for motion toward something, or for direction; usually *ana muhhi* is used; but cf. *māru ana mārî lā itūr* "son may not return (in court) against son" *4:189:20. See also *ana muhhi* and *ana panî* below.

arî "behind": written EGIR and EGIR-*kî*. It occurs alone only once: EGIR *tuppi annî* "after this tablet (is completed)" 4:163:30'; several times with *ina*, in the expression *ina arî ûmî* "forever (lit.: after the days)" e.g., 4:169:18.

aššum: once written *āš-šūm* (5:103:5); otherwise always *aš-šum*. It occurs with the meaning "concerning," often in the (elliptical¹⁸⁸) expression *aššum dîni...ša tašpura* "concerning the case...about which you wrote" e.g., 5:95:5ff.,

¹⁸⁷In U, *ina* is normally used for this purpose; see below, p. 265.

¹⁸⁸See below, pp. 159f.

and often. It is also found with the verbs *ragāmu* "to contest" (p., e.g., 4:173:14ff.) and *tamû* "to swear" (4:155:15f.), and the expressions *dīna gerû* "start a lawsuit" (*An Or*48:12:21ff.) and *ana māmīti nadānu* "to impose an oath" 4:167:10ff.

biri: see the compound prepositions, below, s.v.

eli: does not occur.

ina: always written *i-na*, has a broad range of uses: e.g., locative: *ina GN litmû* "let them swear in GN" 5:15:43f.; *ina bit kīli kalī-mi* "was held in a prison" *5:108:6f.; completed motion to a place: *ina GN tultellīšunūti* "she sent them over to GN" 4:122:10f.; *ina ekalli...lā elli* "she not go up into the palace" *AnOr*48:11f.:13f.; *ina GN uttērši* "he sent her back to GN" *ibid.*:9; also with *erēbu*, in contrast to normal Akk. usage (with *ana*):¹⁸⁹ [*ša*] *ina mātīšu ...irrubû* "who enter his land" 4:54:11f.; cf. also 4:209:5f.; temporal (time "when"): *ina šērti umaššarūka* "in the morning they will release you" *5:109:9f.; instrument: *ina emū[qi]* "by force" 6:36:5; cf. *ina māmīti itammû* "they will swear by an oath" 4:156f.:22,40. In several of these functions, *ina* is augmented by *libbi* (q.v.); cf. also (*ina*) *arki*, *ina biri*, *ina panī*. *ina* seems often to be replaced by *ištu* (q.v.).

¹⁸⁹_{AHW}, 234b (*erēbu*, G 1).

ištu: always *iš-tu* (never *ultu*). This preposition has a very broad semantic range in K. It often, of course, denotes motion "away from": e.g., *ištu māmīti nahāsu/tāru* "to shrink/turn away from (taking) an oath" (e.g., 4:162:5'f.; 4:173:11); or "out of": e.g., *ištu mātīni uṣṣū-mā-mi* "they go out of our country" 4:162:18'. It is used temporally once: *tuppu annū ištu ša ababi šarri kanik* "This tablet was sealed since (the time of) the king's grandfather" 4:55:20f.¹⁹⁰ But other phrases with *ištu* are not common in regular Akk. In one text, e.g., it occurs where *kī* is expected: *ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tētenepušū* "treat him well, according to his rank."¹⁹¹ Very often, *ištu* appears to replace an expected *ina*; thus, note: *PN₁ PN₂ ištu dīni iltēšu* "PN₁ defeated PN₂ in court" 4:178:4f.,¹⁹² for normal Akk. *PN ina dīni le'ū*.¹⁹³ Instead of **ina X qāt PN iteli*, there occurs *PN ištu X kaspi qātšu eteli* "PN

¹⁹⁰This seems more likely than that *ištu* expresses the agent ("by the king's grandfather"), as Nougayrol takes it. The use of *ša* here with *ištu* is unique in K.

¹⁹¹Nougayrol has: "tache de lui procurer de bonne façon ce qui lui revient"; CAD Z, 148a (*zittu* 7) renders: "according to what is due to him." This seems to be a unique meaning of *zittu* as well. It is possible, though unlikely, that *ištu* here is the (usually) Ass. preposition (*išti*) meaning "with," but its range of meaning too does not seem to include the one necessary here; cf. AHw, 401; CAD I/J, 283.

¹⁹²Cf. perhaps also 4:174:9'.

¹⁹³Cf. the examples in CAD L, 155b (*le'ū* 2a), and this U passage: *u iltē PN...ina dīni ana pī šībūtīšu* "and PN... won the case on the testimony of his witnesses" 3:72a:7f.

forfeited X silver" 4:166:5, cf. 7.¹⁹⁴ There is also the following: *šarrat GN zittašunu ištu kaspi hurāši ištu unū-tēšunu ištu gabba mimmušunu tittadin-ma* "The queen of GN provided their inheritance out of the silver (and) gold, and out of their vessels, out of all their property" 4:121:7ff.; cf. also *4:189:26ff. Again, in these sentences, *ina* is expected.¹⁹⁵ Finally, note: *PN ištu damt...zaku* "PN is free of blood(-claims)..." 6:37:15ff., whereas native Akk. uses *ina* when what one is "free" of is specified (although this is rare).¹⁹⁶ Cf. also *ištu (lāt)*, below under *lātu*. It is possible that in at least some of these expressions, the abnormal occurrence of *ištu* reflects a word in a substrate dialect, which it normally translated.¹⁹⁷

itti "with": always *it-ti*, expresses accompaniment, of persons (cf. *qadu*, below): e.g., *ittiya ul āšbū* "they are not living with me" 3:3:6f.; *unūte ša ittīšu ihalliḡū* "the utensils that might be lost with him" 4:153f.:10f., 15f.;

¹⁹⁴For native Akk., cf. the examples in CAD E, 125a (*eḷū* 3 b 3'). For this expression in K, see above, 45f.

¹⁹⁵Cf. *Ahw*, 380b (*ina* II 1 c); *GAG* §114c.

¹⁹⁶There are very few examples of this in CAD Z, but cf. pp. 27a and 29b (*zakū* 2b and 5a 1'). In OA, *zakū* is often construed with *išti* "with (respect to)" plus the person who has a claim (cf. CAD Z 28 - *zakū* 3), but it is doubtful that that idiom influenced the one found here.

¹⁹⁷Perhaps WS **min*, which would likely be used in most of the expressions above (cf. Joñon, *GHB* §133e, p. 406; §170i, p. 623), or, more likely, a preposition which covered the range of both *ina* and *ištu*, such as Ugaritic *b*; see below, p. 266, and n. 395.

šumma RN itti FN...idabbub "if RN speaks with FN..." AnOr 48:12:17ff. In 4:121:4ff., it must be translated "against": *PN₁ u PN₂ itti RN...hīṭata ihtaṭū* "PN₁ and PN₂ committed a crime against RN..." Similarly, it is used with *nakāru* "to be hostile or at war with/ against" in 4:54f.:1f., 3f., 16f. In *X itti Y ana dīni iṣniqū* "X and Y came to court," *itti* replaces the conjunction *u*, the verb remaining in the pl.: 4:166:2f.; 4:168:2ff; 6:36:2f.; 6:37:2f.; with *u*, cf. 4:176:2; etc. Finally, note the adverbial expression *itti ahāmīš* "together (lit.: with each other)" in 4:151:13.

kī "like, as": written *ki-i*, occurs only three times: *kī šarrāqi mullā umalla* "Like a thief, he will pay a fine" 4:163:31'; [ša] *ina mātīšu kī munnabtūti irrubū* "who enter his land as fugitives" 4:54:10f.; once, with *ša*:¹⁹⁸ *mullā kī ša GN lu(-)u-aḷ-li-ni-šu*¹⁹⁹ "They will pay a fine according to (the custom of) GN" 5:95:38f. Note that *kī* also occurs with and without *ša* as a conjunction; see below,

kīma and *kīmē*: do not occur as prepositions.

kīmā: only in: 7 *napšāti...ki-i-mu-ū bīt PN₁ bīt PN₂ u ki-i-mu-ū bīt PN₃ ana PN₄ ittadin* "he gave PN₄ seven persons...in exchange for the estates of PN₁, PN₂, and PN₃" 4:168:8ff.

¹⁹⁸Cf. CAD K, 324f. (*kī c*).

¹⁹⁹The verb form remains obscure; cf. Ug. 5, 95, n.3.

libbi (4:163:26'): see the compound prepositions, below.

qadu "together with": always *qa-du*, used four times with persons, with the verb *tamû*: *PN qadu šībūtīšu litmā-mi* "Let PN together with (or: and) his witnesses swear" 5:95:10f., 28f., 32f.; cf. 4:159:22f., 28f. Twice in one text, it occurs with inanimate objects: *bīt PN qadu maškanīšu kirīšu* "...u *qadu gabbi mimmūšu* "PN's estate, with its threshing floor, its orchard, with and with (its) new everything" 4:167:14ff.

b. Compound Prepositions.

Here are listed the most common compound prepositions, i.e., idiomatic expressions composed of a simple preposition and a noun in the bound form. They are listed alphabetically, first by the noun, then by the preposition.

biri "between": after *ina*: *PN u amīlū GN ina bi-ri-šu-nu imtagrū* "PN and the men of GN agreed among themselves" 4:172:9f.; *māmīta ina be-ri-šu-nu taltakan* "she imposed an oath between them" 4:122:12f. In the only other passage, *biri* is repeated, but *ina* is deleted in the second instance; also, *ša* is used: *rikīlta ina be-ri ša GN₁ u be-ri ša GN₂ akanna irkus* "He made a treaty between GN₁ and GN₂ as follows" 4:154f.:4f.

lētu: occurs once, with *ištu*: *šar GN istu le-et PN...* *iptaṭaršu* "the king of GN ransomed him from PN..." 4:165:5ff. In a similar sentence, *ištu* alone occurs: *PN istu sutī...iptaṭaršu* "PN ransomed him from the Suteans..." 3:

7:8ff. In both cases, *ištu* is probably for normal Akk. *ina*; see above, and note, e.g., the following MB example: *uṭṭeta ina le-et PN muḫur* "accept wheat from PN," cited in Aro, *SMBG*, 108f.²⁰⁰

libbu: *ina libbi* (usually *i-na ŠĀ*; but *i-na ŠĀ-bi* in 4:155f.:7,29; 4:168:9; not found in the letters) is usually a synonym of *ina*, with locative meaning: e.g., *ina libbi bīt kīli iltakanšū-mi u ina libbi bīt [kīli] imūt-mi* "he put him in prison, and he died in prison" 6:36:6f., but *ina bīt kīli kalē-mi* "he was held in prison" *5:108:7; *ina libbi GN ihtanabbatū-mi* "they keep making incursions into GN" 4:162f.:19', cf. 15', but *ša ina GN ihtanabbatū ibid.:* 20. In one instance, *ina* is deleted after *ša*:²⁰¹ *mīnum-mē ardī...ša libbi GN ašbū* "whatever servants...live in GN" 4:163:26'; but cf. *mīnum-mē ardī...ina GN ašbū-mi ibid.:* 21f. On other occasions it is likely that *ina libbi* is used rather than simply *ina* to emphasize the locative notion: e.g., *šumma amīl GN ina libbi GN iddāk* "if a man is killed within (the borders of) GN" 4:153f.:20ff.; cf. 4ff.; 4:155f.:7ff.,29f.; 4:127:9f. Once, the expression denotes inclusion: *7 napšāti ina libbīšunu 3 amīl 4 sinnišāti* "seven persons, among them three men (and) four women" 4:168:8f.

²⁰⁰*ištu lēt* meaning "from (a person)" occurs elsewhere in the Ras Shamra texts: e.g., *Ug.* 5:118:15f. (from Qadesh); *PRU* 4:224:19f. (probably from Khatti); *Ug.* 5:132:7' (origin unknown). *lētu* is not attested in U, however.

²⁰¹Cf. *GAG* §115c.

The above are all the attestations of the phrase.

muhhu: ana muhhi (once *a-na* UGU 4:194:5; otherwise always *a-na muh-hi*) is used very often to denote motion toward or against someone, in several idioms: (a) frequently in the expression *lū sulmu ana muhhiika* "well-being be to you" in the introduction of all the letters except *5:90f.; (b) in *X kaspā (mullā) ana muhhi Y šakānu* "to fine someone(Y) X silver;" e.g., *šarru 140 šiqil kaspā mullā ana muhhi PN iltakan* "the king fined PN 140 shekels of silver" 4:178:6ff.; cf. 4:176:9f.; 4:179:9f. 5:94:12ff.; with the same verb, note: *narkabāti [ša an]a muhhiika...iltaknū* "the chariots which were placed in your charge..." 4:192:11ff. (c) related to these is *400 kaspū ana muhhi PN₁ u ana muhhi PN₂ [an]ā[k]u(?) hubbuł-mi* "400 silver is owed to me(?) by (or: charged...against) PN₁ and PN₂" 5:94:8ff.; cf. *800 kaspū...ša ana muhhiya* "the 800 silver...which was owed by me" *ibid.* 18ff.; (d) with *rāhu: 600 kaspū ana muhhišu irtēh-mi* "600 silver remains (owing) by him" *ibid.*:16f.;²⁰² (e) also in the very common expression *ana muhhi PN ragāmu*

²⁰²In one instance, it is probable that *ana* has been deleted after *ša* (cf. GAG §115c,h): *kaspū [š]a muhhišu uttahir-mi danniš* "the silver owed by him is greatly in arrears" 5:94:10f. Nougayrol restores *[an]a* rather than *[š]a* at the beginning of l.11. Without the relative pronoun, however, the sentence would probably mean "the silver is greatly in arrears against him," which makes less sense in the context. What is visible after the break is ~~libbu~~, which could be the end of either *na* or *ša*. Cf. also the omission of *ina* after *ša* in 4:163:26', quoted above, under *libbu*.

"to contest (a case) against someone," e.g., 4:166:10, and p.; (f) once with a verb of motion: *ana muhhi [šam]ši alik* "go to the Sun" 5:103:r5'f.²⁰³

panū: occurs with *ana* (always *a-na pa-ni*), meaning "in the presence of, before": e.g., *ana panī RN sākīnu u PN ana dīni išniqū* "The prefect and PN came to court in the presence of RN" 4:176:1f., and p. at the head of legal texts;²⁰⁴ *ana panī DN māmīta ina berišunu taltakan* "She imposed an oath between them before DN" 4:122:12f.; cf. *ana panī ahhī...itammūni* "they will swear in the presence of the brothers..." 4:157:39f.²⁰⁵

qātu: occurs only once in a prepositional expression, in a text whose K origin is not absolutely certain:²⁰⁶ *zaki PN₁ u PN₂...ištu ŠU PN₃* "PN₁ and PN₂...are free (of claims) from PN₃" *4:189:26ff.

6. Adverbs

The following alphabetical list contains all the adverbs or words used adverbially that occur.

adīni "until now": probably once in a broken context in

²⁰³Cf. also *amīl(a)ya ana muhhi mārīya aṭruss[u]* "I sent my man to to my son" **4:196:8f.

²⁰⁴Cf. also 4:162:18' (with *qabū* "speak"); 4:179:7 (with *tarāsu* "make confirmation").

²⁰⁵In **4:197:12f., *ina panī* occurs: *mamma ina panīšu lū lā iparrik* "No one must stand in his way."

²⁰⁶This perhaps casts further doubt on the origin of this text. See above, p. 19.

*5:91:12:][a]-di-ni[. ²⁰⁷

ahāmiš "each other, together": only once, preceded by *itti*:
itti a-ha-miš isal[lamū] "(when) they are at peace with
each other" 4:151:13.

akanna "thus": always *a-kān-na*, very frequently with verbs
involving speaking (e.g., *qabū* "speak," *tamū* "swear," *parāsu*
"render a decision"), with reference to the quote (or oath,
or decision) that follows: e.g., *PN akanna iqbī mā* "PN
spoke as follows: (quote)" 4:179a:3f., and *p*. It can also
refer to an action or quantity mentioned previously: e.g.,
inanna atta aka[nnā] tētepuš "Now, you have acted in this
way" *5:109:12f., referring to 11.6ff.; *kī mašmē n[arka]bāt*
šamšu iqtat[ū] akanna šūbi[la] "However many chariots the
Sun commanded, send that many" 5:103:6ff.; etc. Note also
mulīa akannā-ma "the fine is the same" 4:154:23.

anumma "now, hereby": always *a-nu-ma*, found only in the
letters; followed by (a) the dur.: e.g., *anumma PN...*
illakakku "Now, PN...is coming to you" 4:192:5ff.; cf. 3:
7:19ff.; *5:109:r11'f; (b) the perf.: e.g., *anumma middata*
mūraka u ruṣša ultēbilakku "I hereby send you the measure-
ment, length and width" 4:194:6ff.; cf. 3:3f.:8f.; 4:188:
15ff.; (c) once by the pret.: *anumma ištu ekalli išpurū-*

²⁰⁷P.-R. Berger, in *UF* 2, 286, proposes ...*pal-a-ṭi-ni*
"our borders," but this is unlikely; *pātu* is elsewhere in
K (eight times, including twice in this text) always writ-
ten with the logogram ZAG.

nīkku "Now then, they wrote to you from the palace" 3:6:9f.

appūna "moreover": normally at the beginning of the sentence: *u ap-pu-na ina GN lā utārši* "Moreover, he will not return her to GN" *AnOr*48:12:14; but before the verb in *ibid.*:16: *ina ekalli ša šar GN ap-pu-na lā elli* "She may not go up, moreover, to the palace of the king." Elsewhere, the particle occurs twice with *-ma*: *ap-pu-na-ma šarru [akan]na iqbi* "Moreover, the king spoke as follows" 4:163:21'; cf. 4:193:13.

arkānu "afterwards": only in *u EGIR-nu a[na dīni lā un]lammašūšu* "and afterwards he may not be taken to court" 4:161:15f.

ašrānu "there": only in *PN₁ aš-ra-nu itti PN₂ ašābi illaka* "PN₁ is coming there to live with PN₂" 4:193:6ff.

danniš "greatly": once, uniquely following the verb: *kaspu ...uttahhir-mi dan-niš* "The silver...is greatly in arrears" 5:94:10f.

enūma: probably an adverb in K, meaning "now then" or the like; see below, pp. 140f.

gabbu: used adverbially in the acc., meaning "entirely," in 4:128:11, quoted above, pp. 41f.

inanna "now": frequently at the beginning of sentences,

as an interjection, "now then,"²⁰⁸ e.g., 5:94f.:24,37,43. Occasionally, it retains its original temporal sense: e.g., *inanna RN šarru šanuttīšu iknuk* "King RN has now sealed it again" 4:55:22f. *inanna* is never preceded by *u*. The double adverbial expression *inanna anumma* does not occur in K.

kām-ma "thus": from *kām-ma*, once, in the very difficult clause *šumma amīlam(!?) mīta(?) ka-a-ma iṣabbatūni*²⁰⁹ "if they find(?) a dead man(??) in this way(?)" 4:155:19. Note that MB has only *kām*, and once *kā*.²¹⁰

kīkī "how?": proposed by Nougayrol in *5:90:11: [*kī-i-kī*]-*i akanna tēteṭ[uš]*, which he translates: "[Comment d]onc as-tu pu [agir] ainsi?" But [*am-mi-ni*]-*i* is just as likely: "Why have you acted thus?"


lā "not": see below, pp. 110ff.

minsu "for what reason?": perhaps in *mi-in-s[ū(?)]*²¹¹...] *mārat šamši ramā[nša i]ṣtu qaqqarīš[a...] uttakkirašši* "For what reason has he removed the daughter of the Sun herself from her ground?(?)" *5:109:13ff. However, it must be

²⁰⁸Cf. CAD I/J, 144a.

²⁰⁹For this reading, see below, p. 116, n. 321.

²¹⁰Aro, *SMbG*, 116f.

²¹¹Nougayrol reads *mi-in-d[ā(?) -a-ka(??)]*, and translates the clause: "Quelqu'[un des tiens(??)] a enlevé la fille du Soleil en person[n]e sur son territoire." But *mīndā(ka)* is not attested in Akk. The beginning of the broken sign in question is . The sentence remains problematic.

pointed out that *minsu* is so far attested only in SB and NB.²¹²

mithāriš: normally in Akk., this adverb means "to the same extent, all together."²¹³ In its sole occurrence in K, however, it means "likewise, as well": *šar GN 400 kaspā [šā]šu*²¹⁴ *mi-it-ha-ri-iš ana muhhi PN iltakan-mi* "The king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN as well" 5:94:12ff.

šanīta "moreover": not attested in K.

*šanūti*²¹⁵ "for the second time": only in *ša-nu-ut-ti-šu iknuk* "he sealed it for the (lit.: its, referring to the tablet) second time" 4:44:23. The double *-tt-* is an Ass. feature.²¹⁶

šēram: see *urram*, below.

tābiš "well": with *kī* in *kī DU₁₀.GA-iš lū tētenepuššu* "treat him well" 4:193:11f., 23f.; cf. [*kī(?)*] *DU₁₀.GA-iš [...š]ukunšu* "Place him well..." *5:109:r13'f.²¹⁷

²¹²CAD M/2, 89a.

²¹³Cf. CAD M/2, 132ff.

²¹⁴On this reading, see above, p. 35, n. 60.

²¹⁵Cf. GAG §71b, and AHw, 1167b, according to which this form is a MB/MA development.

²¹⁶GAG §20d.

²¹⁷Cf. also [*kī(?)*] *DU₁₀.GA dugulšu* "treat him well" **4:197:17f.

uḷ "not": see below, pp. 110ff.

umma "thus": see below, p. 91.

urram: only with šēram (always ur-ra-am se-ra-am) meaning "in future," at the beginning of prohibitions in legal texts: e.g., urram šēram PN₁ ana muhhi PN₂ lā iraggum "In future, PN₁ may not contest against PN₂" 4:166:9ff.; also in 4:128:12; 4:164:7; 4:167:20; 4:168:13; 6:37:17.

yānu: does not occur in K.²¹⁸

yānum-ma "or else, conversely" (AnOr48:12:19,20): see below, p. 128.

7. The Enclitic Particle -mê

The WPA enclitic particle -mê (written me-e)²¹⁹ occurs on several forms in K. From the interrogative pronouns mīnu(m) "what?" and mannu(m) "who?" (neither attested in K), it forms the indefinite pronouns mīnum-mê "whatever" and mannum-mê "whoever."²²⁰ From the interrogative adverb kī

²¹⁸In 4:164:10f., Nougayrol reads NU.TUK as yānu. However, lā iṣṣu is a more likely reading of the logogram in the context: aššum bīt PN ša RN šar GN bēl dīnīšu NU.TUK "concerning PN's estate (now belonging) to RN king of GN, he (i.e., the king) will have no adversary." Also, in a U text, NU.TUK is glossed la i-šu-ni (3:102:15); and cf. I/J, 289ff. In 5:95:49, la-nu-ma is to be read ayyānum-ma "anyone"; see above, pp. 40f.

²¹⁹AHw, 639b.

²²⁰See above, pp. 37ff.

maṣi "how many?"²²¹ is derived the indefinite relative adverb *kī-maṣi-mê* "however many," which occurs twice: *aššum narkabāti ša tašpura ki-i ma-ṣi-me-e n[arkaba]t*²²² *šamšu iqtab[ū]*²²³ *akanna šūbi[la]* "Concerning the chariots about which you wrote: send however many chariots the Sun has commanded" 5:103:5ff.;²²⁴ *anumma PN...illakakku ṣābīka u narkabātī!ka immar ki-i ma-ṣi-me-e [ṣāb]ī narkabāti! [ša an]la muhḫīka ištu ekalli iltaknu šūšir* "Now PN is coming to see your troops and chariots. Make ready however many troops (and) chariots were placed at your disposal from the palace" 4:192:6ff.²²⁵

²²¹Cf. AHw, 622a (*maṣū* G 6); GAG §120a α; CAD M/2, 346f. (*maṣū* l e ;').

²²²It is assumed here that *kī-maṣi-mê* is not of itself a relative pronoun or conjunction, and that a relative clause must be introduced in some other way. This would of course usually be *ša* (as is almost certainly to be restored in the next example); since there is no *ša* in this passage, the further assumption has been made that we are dealing with a *bīt tpušu* construction. Thus, literally: "according to (*kī*) whatever (*-mê*) sufficiency/amount (*maṣi*) of chariots which (*narkabāt*) the Sun has commanded."

²²³All that is visible of Nougayrol's restored *-b[ī]*, and our proposed *-b[u-ū]* is: *an*.

²²⁴This seems to make more sense than Nougayrol's rendering: "Quant aux chars dont tu m'as mandé: 'Combien de chars?' le Soleil a (simplement) dit[(?)]: 'Envoie!'"

²²⁵Nougayrol translates from *ṣābīka* as follows: "Il va voir à combien montent tes soldats et tes chars. (Donc,) soldats et chars qui ont été mis à ta charge par le Palais mets en route." One reason for rejecting this is that clauses in K are almost without exception verb-final (see below, p. 93); thus, *kī-maṣi-mê* should go with *šūšir* rather than *immar*. Furthermore, our interpretation affords a closer parallel to the previous example. Finally, *-mê* does not seem to form interrogatives, but rather always indefinite pronouns.

-*mê* is also suffixed to *kî* to form *kîmê*,²²⁶ which appears twice as a conjunction (but never as a preposition) in K, possibly differing in meaning from *kî*.²²⁷ Finally, -*mê* may in one instance be attached to *šumma*, with no apparent difference in meaning: *mā šumma-mê tamkārū ša mandatti ša šar GN₁ ina libbi GN₂ iddukkū-mi*²²⁸ "if traders with endowment capital²²⁹ of the king of GN₁ are killed in GN₂" 4:154ff.:6f.; note the parallel clause in the second half of the text: *u šumma tamkārū ša šar GN₂ ša mandatti ina libbi GN₁ iddukkū*²²⁸ 11.28f. It is possible, however, that in the earlier clause, -*me-e* is a scribal error for -*mi*, the particle indicating direct speech (see the next section); note that the clause is introduced by *mā*, and that -*mi* is written with *ME* in this text. Thus, we would have *šum-ma-mî<<-e>>*; as support for this possibility, note *mā šum-ma-mî* in the parallel text 4:158ff.:15,30.

8. Markers of Direct Speech

The enclitic particle -*mi*²³⁰ is always written with *MI* in the letters and legal texts, and in 4:54f. (an edict).

²²⁶Cf. AHW, 478a.

²²⁷*kîmê* occurs in 4:151:11; *5:109:8; on its meaning in K, see below, pp. 138f.

²²⁸For this normalization of *i-du-ku-mî* and *i-da-ku*, see below, p. 131, n. 368.

²²⁹For this meaning of *man/ddattu*, see CAD M/1, 15 (mng. 3).

²³⁰Cf. GAG §123c.

In the treaties 4:154ff. and 4:158ff., *ME* (*mē*) is used. Phonologically, *-mi* has the effect on words to which it is attached as *-ma*. Thus, the final *m* of the ventive is preserved: *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11; *id-nam-mi* 4:168:7; and final vowels are lengthened: *it-ma-a-mi* 4:166:4,6; *ni-de₄-e-mi* 4:163:20; *us-šú-ma-a-mi* 4:162:18'.

-mi most often occurs in direct quotes, usually attached to one word (normally the predicate) in each clause.²³¹ Quotes are introduced by the particle *mā* (*ma-a*):²³² e.g., *PN itti šar GN...ana dīni išniqū mā ardūya šunū-mi u ina tupptiya kanki šaṭrū-mi terraššunūtī-mi ū šumma pūhī ardīya idnam-mi* "PN together with the king of GN went to court, (saying): 'They are my servants, and are written on my tablet. Return them to me, or else give me substitutes for my servants'" 4:168:2ff.²³³

mā and the direct quote may follow verbs other than those of speaking; other possibilities are: *parāsu* "to decide" (e.g., 4:170:10), *ṣabātu* "to take hold of (for payment)" (e.g., *4:189:5), *mahāru* "to approach" (e.g., 4:162:7'). Once, *mā* is repeated during a quote, perhaps to indicate clearly that the following sentence is also part of

²³¹In some quotes containing several clauses, however, *-mi* occurs only once or twice: e.g., in 4:54f.; 4:154ff.; 4:158ff.; 4:169ff.

²³²*GAG* §121b lists this as an Ass. (M/NA) particle.

²³³Similar examples occurs, e.g., in 3:7f.; 4:176f.; 5:94f.

the quotation: *mārū GN litmū mā šumma hapīrū ša dimta im-
haṣū [nīdē-m]i mā šumma attūni hapīrū ša dimta šāšu imtah-
ha[ṣū-m]i* "Let the citizens of GN swear: 'We do not know
the Hapiru who struck down the tower; nor are the Hapiru
who kept striking down said tower ours' " 4:162:2'ff.

The particle *umma* (always written *um-ma*) occurs *p.* in
letter introductions in the expression *umma X-(ma)* "thus
(says) X." It also begins the royal edict 4:54f.: *umma
šarrim-ma* "Thus (says) the king." It is found only once
in the legal texts, where it announces a reply: *PN₁...PN₂
...iṣbat mā 300 kasper habbulātā-mi umma PN₂...mā mīmma lā
habbulākū-mi* "PN₁...seized PN₂...: 'You owe 300 silver';
thus PN₂...: 'I owe nothing' " *4:189:2ff.

On the case of the noun after *umma*, see above, p. 46.

9. Assyrian Forms

The number of certain Assyrianisms is quite small.

They are:

(i) the *a*-vowel in the following verbs: *e-pa-aš* 4:
192:16; *e-tap-ša-am-mi* 4:176:11; *e-tap-šu-mi* *ibid.*:8; *ha-
bu-la-tā/ku-mi* *4:189:6,8;

(ii) the double *-tt-* in the abstract ending of two
words (Bab. -ūt): *ša-nu-ut-ti-šu* 4:55:23; *īr-ut-ti* 4:165:
8; 234

²³⁴It should be pointed out that there are other, unex-
plained, consonant doublings in K (see above, p. 23). It
is possible that the forms with *-tt-* are simply two more
examples, rather than Assyrianisms.

(iii) the 3ms independent pronoun *šū-ū-ut*, in 4:164:14; 4:193:20,21;

(iv) the 3mp acc. suffix *-šunu*, in 3:8:26.

There are several other possible Assyrianisms in the corpus:

(v) other verb and noun forms with *e* for expected Bab. *i*; but these probably merely indicate a lack of contrast between the two vowels in K; see above, pp. 24f.;

(vi) the 3fs verbs with prefix *t-* in 4:122:10,11,13; but these could be due to WS influence; the forms are cited above, p. 52;

(vii) the preposition *ištu*, meaning "with, according to" in 4:193:10,22 (above, p. 76);

(viii) the particle *mā*, indicating direct speech follows; see above, p. 90.

(ix) the possibly subjunctive form *nī-id-du₄-ku* in an oath in 5:95:48; see above, p. 61.

(x) the use of *-ma* in the royal genealogies in legal texts; see below, pp. 115f.

(xi) the use of *lū* before *lā* in prohibitions; see below, p. 111, and n. 303.

D. SYNTAX

1. Word Order²³⁵

a. Verbal Clauses.²³⁶

These exhibit remarkably normal Akk. prose word order.

In the entire K corpus, there is only one example in which the verb is not clause-final:²³⁷ *u kaspu [š]a²³⁸ mūhḫī[š]u uttahir-mi dāniš* "and the silver which he owes is greatly in arrears" 5:94:10f. It is more likely that the adverb follows the verb for greater emphasis, than that there is some substrate influence at work here.

The usual order of the sentence constituents in all the text genres is: (S)-(O)-(A)-V.²³⁹ The parentheses indicate constituents that occur in some, but not all, sentences. Some examples: *[u] šar GN 400 kaspa [š]āš²⁴⁰*

²³⁵Cf. GAG §§130c, 131.

²³⁶Clauses with the stative are discussed in a separate section, below.

²³⁷Another occurs with a stative; see below. Two other examples are found according to Nougayrol's translations. One is 4:192:6ff., for his and our interpretation of which, see above, p. 88, and n. 225. The other is in a broken context: *u kaspa mullā ša napšātī 3 mana (ša ištēn amīli?)* *ušallamūni mārū GN* [... Nougayrol translates: "alors, en argent, (comme) compensation des viefs, 3 mines par homme] ils paieront, les fils de Carke[miš]" There is no reason, however, that *mārū GN* could not be part of the following sentence.

²³⁸For this reading, see above, p. 81, n. 202.

²³⁹These symbols represent S(ubject), O(bject), A(dverbial phrase), P(redicate).

²⁴⁰For this reading, cf. p. 35, n. 60.

mithāriš ana muhhi PN iltakan-mi "and the king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN at the same time" 5:94:17f.; *u mārū GN makkūr(?)šunu unūtēšunu akanna ušallamūni* "and the citizens of GN will repay their possessions and vessels appropriately" 4:155:17f.; *sākinnu 140 šiqil kaspā ana PN ittadin* "The prefect has given 140 shekels of silver to PN" 4:178:8ff. Certain adverbs (e.g., *anumma*, *inanna*) and adverbial phrases (e.g., *urram šēram*, *ana panē X*, *ina arki umi*) by their very nature come first in the sentence;²⁴¹ these will be symbolised by Ap (preposed adverb).

Several variations on the basic word order occur. For example, the direct object occasionally precedes the subject: e.g., *kaspā šāšu PN ušallim* (O-S-V) "PN will(?) pay that silver 4:177:20f.²⁴² Sporadically, an adverbial (prepositional) phrase comes before either the subject or the object: e.g., *ša ina libbi GN mārāt RN...ēpušu* (A-S-V) "which the daughter of RN...acquired in GN" 4:127:9f.²⁴³ In some of these cases, the inversion may be to emphasize the constituent in question, but often, no reason for the variation is discernible. It should be noted, finally, that these alternate word orders are more common in the treaties and legal texts than in the letters (where they

²⁴¹E.g., 3:3:8f.; 4:162:13'; 4:168:8ff., 13ff.; 4:178:10ff.; cf. *GAG* §131b.

²⁴²Cf. also *ibid.*:10f., 22f. (both O-S-V), 26ff. (O-S-A-V); 5:95:53f. (O-S-A-V).

²⁴³Cf. also 4:162:14'.

are in fact quite rare).

b. Clauses with the Stative.²⁴⁴

In one clause, the subject follows the verb: *inanna saḫi PN₁...ištu qāti PN₂* (Ap-V-S-A) "Now PN₁ is free (of claims) from PN₂" *4:189:26. Here the order seems to be WS.²⁴⁵ Otherwise, the stative, like the fientic conjugations of the verb, is always clausefinal. A few examples will illustrate this; in the same text as the above, note: *300 kaspā habbulātā-mi* (O-V) "You owe 300 silver" *ibid*:5f., cf. 8. Other examples are: *PN₁ ištu damī [ša ahi] PN₂ zaku* "PN₁ is absolved of the blood of PN₂'s brother" 6:37:15f.; *enūma hapīrū ittīya ul ašbū* "The Hapiru are not living with me" 3:3:6f.; *tamkārū ša qātīya ina GN dīkū-mi* "Traders under my charge were killed in GN" 4:172:4f.; *tuppu annū ištu ša ababi šarri kanik u hepi* "This tablet had been sealed since the time of the king's grandfather, but was broken" 4:55:20f.

c. Nominal Clauses.²⁴⁶

There are a few occurrences of single words other than verbs which by themselves constitute sentences: e.g., *mūtu napšātu* "it is death; it is life (i.e., a matter of life

²⁴⁴See the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

²⁴⁵The sg. predicate with a compound subject is also a WS feature; see below, p. 107.

²⁴⁶Cf. GAG §126.

and death)" 4:192:20.²⁴⁷

In most sentences, however, both subject and predicate are explicitly expressed. When the subject is a noun, the logical predicate is at the end of the clause; thus, e.g., with a nominal predicate, note: *DN₁...DN₆ lū bēlū māmītēšu* "May DN₁...DN₆ be the lords of his oath" 4:157:49ff.; with an adverbial predicate: *ša mutši itti PN* "whose husband was with PN" 5:94f.:20. The order is unchanged in relative clauses, when the determinative pronoun is subject: *aššum dīni ša PN₁ ša itti arad PN₂* "concerning the case of PN₁, which concerns (lit.: is with) PN₂'s servant" *ibid.*:5f.

When the subject is a personal pronoun, the predicate comes first, and the pronoun at the end. Thus, e.g., with a nominal predicate:²⁴⁸ *ahūšu ša PN šūt mār šarrim-ma šūt* "he is PN's brother; he is the king's own son" 4:193:19ff. The predicate may be a noun phrase rather than a simple noun: *ša kaspi ša PN šū-mi* "It is the one (i.e., the tablet) of PN's money" 4:177:16f.

There is also the following example: *tuppa kanku ša ihpū ul ša 4000 kaspi ša idabbubu šū-mi* "The sealed tablet which he broke was not that of the 4000 silver about which he was speaking" 4:177:14ff. In this sentence, the nominal

²⁴⁷Perhaps also *kittu altariq-mi* in 4:179:8, if the meaning is: "It is true; I stole (it)," rather than "In truth I stole (it)."

²⁴⁸No examples with other types of predicate occur with a pronoun as subject.

subject (*tuppa...ihpū*) is first, and the predicate (a noun phrase plus *ul*) is second, as in the examples from 5:94f. quoted above. But the subject is also resumed by a personal pronoun (*šū*); like the examples 4:193:19ff. and 4:177:16f., it follows the predicate. Another sentence, of similar construction, and from the same text, has an adjective as predicate: *u 4000 kaspu ša idabbubu annū šū-mi* "and *this* (i.e., what has just been explained) is the 4000 silver about which he was speaking"²⁴⁹ 4:176:11f.

There is only one exception to the three basic types discussed above: *šumma attūni hapīrū ša dimta šāšū imtah ha[šū-m]i* "The Hapiru who kept striking down that tower are not ours" 4:162:3'f. Here the predicate (*attūni*) pre-

²⁴⁹That *annū* "this" is the logical (as well as the grammatical) predicate here, is clear from the context. The speaker has just explained *what* the silver in question is (II.5-11).

In both examples in this paragraph, a second *tuppu/kaspu* has been deleted in the surface structure; the first one says, in effect: "the sealed tablet...is not (the tablet) of the X silver"; the second: "the 4000 silver is not *this* (silver)." It is also possible to view the nouns (and their modifiers) at the beginning of both sentences as *casus pendent*. If that were the case, the rest of the sentences would be the same type as 4:193:19ff. and 4:177:16f.; the first would thus be translated: "as for the sealed tablet, which he broke--it is not that of the 4000 silver about which he was speaking"; the second would be: "and as for the 4000 silver, about which he was speaking--it is *this*."

The predicates in both examples are syntactically equivalent to nouns; i.e., the sentences have the shape *X Y šū*, meaning "X is Y." Now, *GAG* §126f notes that this construction first appears in NA and LB. If that is correct, perhaps the present examples are the result of WS influence. For Hebrew *X Y hū*, cf. Jónon, *GHB* §154i, p. 470; for Arabic *X huwa Y*, cf. Wright, *GAL*, II, §124, p. 258; for Aramaic *X hw Y*, cf. C. Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik* (Leipzig, Veb Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1968), §218, p. 116.

cedes the subject.²⁵⁰ Unless this is to emphasize the predicate, there is no obvious reason for the inversion.²⁵¹

2. Modification of the Noun

a. By an Adjective.

Adjectives are very rare in K; only *annû* "this," *kanku* "sealed," *rabû* "great," and *šanû* "(an)other" are attested. The adjective generally agrees with its noun in case, number, and gender (see below, pp.314f.). All the examples follow the noun immediately. There are no instances of a noun modified by more than one adjective, and none of a single adjective modifying more than one noun.

²⁵⁰Nougayrol has: "Ce n'est pas nous, les *Habiru* qui ont je[té bas] ce 'castel'." J. Aro, *AfO* 18 (1957-8), 243, pointed out that "unsere Habiru" is more exact. But it is more likely that *attûni* is used predicatively than attributively here (cf. *CAD* A/2, 513 - *attu* 2a).

²⁵¹Another exception occurs in **4:196, in the greeting: *ittîka mînum-mê šulmāni lî.6ff.* Nougayrol interprets this as a question: "Chez toi est-ce que tout va bien?" Although this is the most likely interpretation, it must be remembered that *mînum-mê* is not an interrogative (cf. *CAD* M/2, 19f.; *AHW*, 656b); thus the sentence itself must be interrogative. This could account for the inversion of subject and predicate (cf. *GAG* §127c). In *AHW*, 1268a (*šulmānu* 4 b β), von Soden seems to construe this formula, and the two words that invariably follow it, namely *tēma tēr/šupur* (here *tēma tišappara*) "send back news," as one clause, meaning something like "send back news concerning whatever well-being is there with (you, etc.)." However, *turru* and *šapāru* do not normally take a double acc., which would be the case here; one would rather expect **tēma ša mînim-mê šulmāni ša ittîka tēr/šupur* (etc.), for von Soden's interpretation.

Note that the order of *ittîka mînum-mê šulmāni* contrasts with that of the ubiquitous formula *lû šulmu ana muhhtika* "Health (be) to you," e.g., l.4 in the same text. This formula is discussed below, p. 299ff.

b. By a Noun in the Genitive.

There are four constructions used to express a genitive relationship: (i) N_1 (bound form) N_2 ; (ii) N_1 *ša* N_2 ; (iii) N_1 -*šu*²⁵² *ša* N_2 ; (iv) *ša* N_2 N_1 -*šu*. Note that N_2 is always in the genitive case. Each of these will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

(i) The most common construction is the use of the bound (construct) form for the nomen regens. However, its high frequency is misleading, since it is always employed for certain nouns which occur very often (e.g., *šarru*, *māru*, *mārtu*, *bītu*, and the prepositional phrases *ana panī*, *ana muhhi*, and *ina libbi*). If these are discounted, the use of the bound form is less common than the use of *ša* (see below, ii). The modifying noun, in the gen., always follows the bound form immediately; note that there are no instances in which a bound form is modified by an adjective, and only one is modified by a relative clause.²⁵³ Series of more than one bound form ("construct chains"²⁵⁴) are found occasionally; they usually involve a fixed expression (such as a prepositional phrase) as one of the constituents: e.g., *ana muhhi šar GN 4:176:9*. There are no examples in which

²⁵²The suffix agrees with N_2 in number and gender.

²⁵³5:95:40ff.: *aššum dīni sinništī ša mutēi itti PN ša ina GN idūkū ša tašpura* "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was with PN, who was killed in GN, about which you wrote me." The third *ša* refers to *dīni*.

²⁵⁴Cf. GAG §135f.

a bound form governs more than one genitive, and none in which two or more bound forms govern a single genitive.

(ii) The expression of the genitive by means of the determinative pronoun *ša*²⁵⁵ is common. It has an advantage over the use of a bound form in that the genitive does not have to follow the nomen regens directly. Thus, an adjective or pronominal suffix may intervene: e.g., *tuppa kanku ša kaspi šāšu* "the sealed tablet of that silver" 4:176:12f. A relative clause modifying the nomen regens, however, always follows the genitive: *aššum dīni ša PN₁ ša itti araḍPN₂ ša tašpura* "concerning the case of PN₁ who is with PN₂'s servant, about which you wrote" 5:94:5f.; *ištu ekallīšu ša GN* "from his palace in (lit.: of) GN" *AnOr*48:12:11.²⁵⁶ Some nouns (e.g., *tamkāru* "merchant, trader" and *mulīu* "fine, mulct") never appear in the bound form, a genitive always occurring instead with *ša*. The reason for this is not clear. Nor does there appear to be any reason for the choice between constructions i and ii in other instances, apart from the advantages just mentioned. That it is not, e.g., a matter of definite versus indefinite is shown by 4:153f., where *šumma amīlu ša GN₁ ina libbi GN₂ iddāk in*

²⁵⁵*ša* in effect stands in apposition to the nomen regens, i.e., "N₁, the one of N₂"; cf. *GAG* §138a.

²⁵⁶This is the only example with a suffix on the nomen regens that is not of the type in constructions iii and iv; and it is possible that it too belongs there, if it means instead "from the palace of GN."

11.4ff. is paralleled by *šumma amīl GN₂ ina libbi GN₁ iddāk* in 11.20ff. Both mean "if a man of (one) GN is killed in (the other) GN."

(iii) The construction exemplified by *ahūšu ša PN* ('PN's brother' 4:193:19f.) occurs already in OB and OA, where it is rare, and apparently indicates strong emphasis and marked determination of the nomen regens.²⁵⁷ It occurs quite frequently in a number of northern WPA dialects,²⁵⁸ and occasionally in some of the other dialects in the texts found at Ras Shamra.²⁵⁹ In K, it is found sporadically in each of the text genres: e.g., besides the illustration above (L), *māršu ša RN₁ mār-mārīšu ša RN₂* "the son of RN₁, the grandson of RN₂" 4:154ff.:2f., 45f.(T); *unūtēšu mimma* [ša] *tamkāri* "any of the trader's vessels" 4:170:7f.(J).²⁶⁰

²⁵⁷GAG §138j.

²⁵⁸Especially in texts from Nuzi (cf. Wilhelm *Hurro-Akkadisch*, p. 29ff.); Mittanni (EA 17-30; cf. Adler, *AKTM*, 92), Boghazkoy (cf. Labat *AkkBo*, 198, and the next note); Amurru in the Amarna tablets (e.g., EA 157:17f., 33; 158:7f.; 160:44; etc.), but not in the Amurru texts from Ras Shamra (PRU 3:182ff.; 4:132ff.; 4:139ff.; 4:141ff.; 4:144ff.; 4:180; 4:214; 4:284ff.; and probably 3:10b; 3:13f.; 3:18; 6:2a).

²⁵⁹In texts from Khatti, only in treaties (e.g., PRU 4:49:7f.). For U texts, see below, pp. 308f. It does not occur in texts from Siyannu, or from Amurru (see n. 258).

²⁶⁰The other occurrences are: *libbašu ša šamši* 4:192:17(L); *mutši ša sinništī* 5:95:46(L); *mār-mārīšu ša RN* 4:121:3; 4:127:3; 4:165:3(all J); *mār-mārīši ša FN* 4:208:6(J). In *AnOr* 48:12:11(J), *ištu ekallīšu ša GN* may be another example; but see above, p. 100, and n. 256.

The origin of this construction is quite problematic. Von Soden²⁶¹ would attribute its use in LB to Aramaic influence (*bereh dē PN* "son of PN"). H.-P. Adler²⁶² would see the same influence in its occurrence in the Amarna letters of Tushratta. It is possible that the former is correct; however, the construction is a *late* Aramaic development; it does not occur in early inscriptions at all,²⁶³ and only rarely in Biblical Aramaic.²⁶⁴ Thus, its appearance in Tushratta's correspondence must originate elsewhere. G. Wilhelm²⁶⁵ has, with reservations, suggested the Canaanite "pleonastic genitive." However, that construction occurs only in Phoenician, very rarely, and does not incorporate a determinative pronoun.²⁶⁶ Perhaps its origin must be considered along with that of the last type of construction.

(iv) Very rarely, the genitive (after *ša*) *precedes* the

²⁶¹GAG §138k.

²⁶²AKTM, 92.

²⁶³Rainer Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenlandische Gesellschaft, Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner, 1969) §§67f., pp. 84ff., especially §68, p. 89.

²⁶⁴Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, rev. ed. (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1963) §48, p. 25.

²⁶⁵Hurro-Akkadisch, pp. 29f.

²⁶⁶Johannes Friedrich and Wolfgang Röllig, *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*, 2nd. ed. (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1970), §309, p. 158.

nomen regens, which usually takes a pronominal suffix. The only examples are: *ša tamkārī (šāšunu) N₁.GU₄.MEŠ-šu-nu unūtū/ēšunu* "the possessions (and) vessels of (those) traders" 4:156f.:24f., 41; cf. 4:159:16, 31f.; probably also *ša mārī GN [qātšunu] u līlī* "the citizens of GN must renounce claim" 4:162:4'f.,²⁶⁷ without a suffix: *ša PN ŠU līlī* "PN must renounce claim" 5:95:29f.,²⁶⁸ The same construction is found sporadically in texts from Boghazkoy²⁶⁹ and Nuzi,²⁷⁰ somewhat more frequently in the Amarna letters from Mitanni.²⁷¹ But it seems never to be as common as the preceding construction. In texts from these other regions, the pronominal suffix on the nomen regens is always present. As Adler points out,²⁷² the *ša N₂ N₁-šu* structure under consideration probably has nothing to do with the same format found in native Akk. poetry. However, I cannot agree with him in considering its origin to be a result of Hurrian influence.²⁷³ In that language, the nomen rectum (marked by

²⁶⁷Perhaps also [*ša(?) šar*] *GN qābūsu narkabātūšu [... līlī illakū* "The troops and chariots of the king of GN will not have to go(?)" 4:151:7f.

²⁶⁸Perhaps also [*ša*] *PN qa-at līlī-mi* 3:8:29. For this expression, see above, p. 45f.

²⁶⁹Labat, *AkkBo*, 198f.

²⁷⁰So Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 42; however, Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*, 29ff., does not mention any examples.

²⁷¹Adler, *AKTM*, 92.

²⁷²*Ibid.*, 92f.

²⁷³*Ibid.*, 110.

a genitive postposition) usually precedes the noun it modifies (although it may also follow it²⁷⁴); but the nomen rectum does not take a pronominal suffix.²⁷⁵ A closer parallel, it seems, is Hittite.²⁷⁶ This would be suitable perhaps for most of the dialects in which the present construction occurs; but it is highly unlikely that Hittite would have influenced the dialect of the Mittanni letters. Moreover, as mentioned above, it seems reasonable to assume that the origins of the constructions iii and iv should be sought together. But the Hittite equivalent of iii is found only when the genitive is an indefinite pronoun.²⁷⁷ As yet, then, no acceptable solution presents itself.

c. By a Relative Clause.

Closely related to the modification of the noun by a noun in the genitive is modification by an attributive relative clause.²⁷⁸ Most relative clauses are of this type.

²⁷⁴Cf. EA 24:III:39ff., 89ff., IV:32f., 65, all cited in Bush, "Hurrian," pp. 174, 271, 265, 266, respectively.

²⁷⁵Cf. Bush, "Hurrian," 129f., and the examples cited in n. 274, above.

²⁷⁶Cf. Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch* I, 3rd. ed. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1974), §210(222)a, p. 122; the construction is: N_2 (gen.) N_1 + pron. suff., e.g., GUD-aš IGI-ŠU "the eye of an ox." The more usual construction in Hittite omits the pronominal suffix, the genitive remaining before the nomen regens (ibid., §209).

²⁷⁷Friedrich, op. cit. (n. 276), §210(222)b, p. 123.

²⁷⁸GAG §165e. Relative clauses are discussed below, pp. 134ff.

They always follow the noun, and its adjective or nomen rectum, when these occur. The noun may be in any case. Some examples: noun in the nom.: *800 kaspu ša PN ša ana muhhtya hubbul* "PN's 800 silver, which was owed by me" 5:94:18ff.; noun in gen.: *aššum dñi sinništi ša mutši itti PN* "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was with PN" *ibid.*:40f.; noun in acc.: *šumma haprt ša dñta imhašū [nīdē]-mi* "We do not know the Hapiru who struck down that tower" 4:162:2'f. On two occasions, attributive relative clauses without *ša* (i.e., *bīt tpušu*) possibly occur; see above, p. 88, and n. 222; and below, p. 135.

d. By a Noun in Apposition.

Another means of qualifying a noun is by simple apposition.²⁷⁹ The qualifying noun appears second. There are no peculiarities in this feature in K, and a few examples will serve to illustrate it: *X kaspa mullā...iltakan* "He imposed a fine of X silver" 4:178:6ff.; *PN tamkāru ardu ša šar GN* "PN the merchant, the servant of the king of GN" 4:169:2. Apposition is also sometimes used to express the material out of which an object is made: e.g., *unūte sipparri* "vessels of bronze" 4:167:11 (but note the use of the bound form of the nomen regens in *unūt sipparri* 4:127:7). The indefinite pronouns may also stand in apposition to a noun:²⁸⁰ *dñna mimma* "any legal action" *AnOr*48:12:23.

²⁷⁹Cf. GAG §134.

²⁸⁰See above, pp. 38f.

3. Agreement

The letters are remarkably consistent in terms of agreement. There are no pl. subjects with sg. verbs, and no sg. subjects with pl. verbs. All adjectives agree with the nouns they modify in case, number, and gender: e.g., *amīlīka annūti* "these men of yours" 3:8:25; *middati šāši* "that measurement" 4:194:9f. And all pronouns have the same number and gender as the nouns to which they refer.

Text 4:54f., a royal edict, may contain one instance of a sg. subject with a pl. verb: *šumma...RN...e-er-ri-šu* "if...RN...demands" 11.12f. However, the verb could just as easily be an incorrect subjunctive.

In the treaty texts, the pl. *unūtū/ēšunu*²⁸¹ is twice construed with a sg. verb, *ihalliḳ*, in 4:156f.:25,41f. Otherwise, these texts too show no lack of correct agreement.

The legal texts, however, contain a number of errors in this regard. Most of the mistakes are due to the formulaic nature of these documents. Thus, e.g., four texts²⁸² correctly have *X u Y ana dīni išniqū* "X and Y went to court." But four others²⁸³ have instead *X itti Y*, with the verb

²⁸¹That *unūtu* is pl. is shown by *unūte...qaqqadšunū-ma* "the vessels, ...their principal" in 4:153:15ff. But perhaps it was felt by some scribes to denote a unit ("property").

²⁸²4:172:2f.; 4:176:2; 4:178:2f.; 4:179:2f.

²⁸³4:166:2f.; 4:168:2ff.; 6:36:2f.; 6:37:2f.

still in the pl., but now incorrectly.²⁸⁴ Similarly, in the prohibition "X may not contest," which occurs near the end of most legal texts, the subject usually sg.,²⁸⁵ and so the verb is *iraggum*. When the subject is pl., which is the case four times, the verb is also usually pl. (three times²⁸⁶); but once,²⁸⁷ *iraggum* occurs, probably because the scribes were more accustomed to writing it. Apart from these examples, there is only one other instance of lack of agreement between subject and verb:²⁸⁸ *inanna zakī PN₁ u PN₂ ahūšu u mārūšunu ištu qāti PN₃* "Now PN₁ and PN₂ and their children are free (of claims) from PN₃" *4:189:26ff. The word order of this sentence (V-S-A) is WS rather than Akk., and it is quite likely that the concord, with the verb agreeing only with the first noun after it, is a WS feature as well.²⁸⁹

²⁸⁴This happens even in OB; cf. *GAG* §132f.

²⁸⁵E.g., 4:167:20ff., 23ff.; 4:128:13ff.; and often.

²⁸⁶4:122:15ff.; 4:173:16ff.; 4:174:17'ff.

²⁸⁷4:171:22f.

²⁸⁸In *gabba unūte annūti ana PN irtihū* "all these vessels belong to PN" 4:167:19, the subject, even though in the wrong case, is probably *unūte annūti*, with *gabba* in apposition; cf. above, p. 42. In *mīnum-mē mārāt RN₁...lū kaspū lū hurāṣu lū erū lū unūt siparri...lū kitū...gabba ana RN₂...irtihū* "whatever of the daughter of RN₁..., whether silver or gold or copper or vessels of bronze...or tunic, belongs entirely to RN₂..." 4:127:5ff., the verb is apparently agreeing with the objects in the list; *mīnum-mē mārāt RN₁* is thus in apposition; *gabba* is an adverbial acc.

²⁸⁹Cf. Jøhø, *GHB* §150q, p. 462; Wright, *GAL*, II, §150,

There is one possible instance of a change of number between two clauses: *šumma a[rk]i tuppi annī amīlī ša ana šīmi iddinū ušellū. kī šarrāqi mullā umalla* "If after this tablet, they produce men whom they sold, he will pay a fine like a thief" 4:163:30'f. The subjects of all the clauses in this sentence are impersonal--they do not refer to any-one in particular. Elsewhere in K, such verbs are always 3mp.²⁹⁰ Thus, the sg. *umalla* is quite unexpected, especially after the pl. verbs in the protasis. One wonders whether the grammatical objects have become the logical subjects of their respective clauses, with the result that the verbs agree with them. The sentence could thus be translated: "If after this tablet, men who were sold are produced, as (in the case of) a thief, a fine will be paid." A less likely possibility is that all the verbs are sg., the forms in *-u* being incorrect subjunctives. Another instance of a possible subjunctive, after *šumma*, in 4:54:12f., was quoted earlier in this section.

In only one legal text is there a lack of agreement between a noun and its adjective; the cases are different in *tuppa kanku* "sealed tablet" 4:177:14,²⁹¹18. In both

p. 294. Yet another probable West-Semitism occurs in the text, in *lā itūr(a)* "may not return" 11.19,20; see above, pp. 57f.

²⁹⁰See the next section.

²⁹¹Nougayrol's transliteration has *tup-pu*, but the copy has *tup-pa*.

instances, the phrase is nom. Perhaps the two previous occurrences of *tuppa kanka* (11.10,12), which are acc., influenced the form of *tuppa* in 11.14,18; but then it is difficult to understand why *kanku* is in the correct case. In 4:162:3', the ms pronoun *šāšu*²⁹² modifies *dimta*, which is probably f. (but see above, p. 25, n. 62).

It should be noted at this point that the K texts exhibit f. pl. forms only in nouns and adjectives. But m. pl. *šāšunu*, which is actually a pronoun, is used to modify f. pl. nouns;²⁹³ another f. pl. noun (*napšātu*) is referred to by m. -*šunu*,²⁹⁴ and the only verb that should be f. pl. is the m. *irtīhū*.²⁹⁵

4. Unspecified (Impersonal) Subject

To express an unspecified subject ("one"; German "man"), or as a circumlocution for the passive, the 3mp is used.²⁹⁶ This is found a few times in each of the K text types, and it is usually best to translate the sentence by a passive construction. Some examples are: *nikkassē ša harrānāti šāšunu ētapšū-mi u X bilat kaspā ana muhhi šar GN iltaknū*
 "The accounts of those caravans were settled, and X talents

²⁹²The fs is *šāš*; cf. 4:194:10; 5:95:51.

²⁹³4:173:2'; 4:176:8; 4:208:7; see above, p. 36.

²⁹⁴4:168:9; see above, p. 32, n. 51.

²⁹⁵4:208:11; see above, p. 54.

²⁹⁶Cf. GAG §75i.

of silver were imposed on the king of GN" 4:176:8ff.(J);²⁹⁷
ina šērti umaššarūka "In the morning you will be released"
 *5:109:10(L).²⁹⁸ In 4:154ff., note that a G verb alternates
 with the corresponding N in parallel sentences: (*šumma...*)
dāikūtīšunu iṣabbatūni l.20, but (*šumma...*) *dāikūšunu iṣ-*
ṣabbatūni l.30, cf. 8,36; both mean "(if...) their murderers
 are caught" (T).²⁹⁹

In one instance, 4:163:31', quoted in the previous
 section, the sg. seems to serve the same purpose as the
 pl. does elsewhere: *umalla* "one will pay."

5. Negation

Both *lā* and *uḷ* occur in K, the former being by far the
 more frequent.³⁰⁰ Both are used in main clauses and in the
 protasis of conditional sentences;³⁰¹ e.g., in main clauses:

²⁹⁷Other examples in J: 4:151:10,15,16.

²⁹⁸Other examples in L: 4:192:14; 3:6:10 (read *iš-pu-*
ru-ni-ik-ku; the *a*-vowels in the transliteration are typo-
 graphical errors).

²⁹⁹On the alternation *dāikūšunu*(nom.)/*dāikūtīšunu*(acc.),
 see above, pp. 46f. For other examples in T, cf. 4:153f.:
 8,14(bis),19.

³⁰⁰*uḷ* occurs five times, *lā* 26, not counting over 15
 occurrences in *lā iraggum* "may not contest," throughout the
 legal texts.

³⁰¹*uḷ* occurs sporadically in conditional clauses in MB
 (and in Mari OB) according to GAG §161b (and cf. Aro, *SMbG*,
 144f.). There seems to be little, if any, difference in
 meaning whether *uḷ* or *lā* is used, in spite of von Soden's
 attempt to delineate one. No examples of subordinate (in-
 cluding relative) clauses with negatives occur in K. *enūma*
 in 3:3:6 (and elsewhere in K) is probably an adverb; see
 below, pp. 140f.

PN ana tummî lā imangur "PN would not agree to take an oath" 4:167:18; *PN unūtēšū mimma ša tamkāri...ul ušēli* "PN did not produce any of the trader's property" 4:170:7ff.; in protases: *šumma dāikūšunu lā iṣṣabbatū* "if their murderers are not caught" 4:156:36; *šumma atta ul tīdēšū* "in case you do not know him" 4:193:17f.³⁰²

Only *lā* is used for prohibitions (negative commands). Occasionally, it occurs alone: e.g., *ina ekalli ša šar GN appūna lā elli u RN ahūši ittīša lā idabbub* "She may not, moreover, go up to the palace of the king of GN; and RN her brother may not speak with her" *AnOr*48:12:13ff.; *[m]amma lā unakkaršunūti* "no one may alter them" 4:188:13f. However, probably because it is also used to negate simple assertions, and therefore does not of itself indicate a prohibition, *lā* is often preceded by the injunctive particle *lū* for such expressions;³⁰³ thus, in a text that closely parallels the last cited: *mamma lū lā unakkaršunūti* 3:7:17f. Other examples are: *libbašu ša šamši mimma lū lā imalla* "May the Sun's heart not be full (of anger) at all" 4:192:17ff.; *[šalr GN ana [dīni(?) m]imma lū lā unamma[šū]šū*

³⁰²This is the only protasis with a negative that occurs in the letters; all the protases with a negative in the treaties have *lā* (seven times); none occur in the legal documents.

³⁰³*lā* alone occurs in prohibitions 21 times, but 15 of those are in the ubiquitous clause ...*lā iraggum* "may not contest..." in 4:167:20ff., 23ff.; etc. (all J). *lū lā* occurs five times (cited below), in effect almost as often as simple *lā*. *GAG* §81h notes *lū lā* for the prohibitive only in NA; *Ahw*, 559b (*lū* A 5), however, lists MA occurrences also.

"one (lit.: they) may not take the king of GN to court(?) in any way" 4:151:9f.; cf. also 4:54f.:14f., and probably *5:91:15.

The vetitive does not occur.

6. The Particle *lū*

the particle *lū* (always written *lu-ū*) has several uses in K. In non-verbal sentences, it indicates a will toward a condition or state:³⁰⁴ e.g., *lū šulmu ana muhḫīka* "May you be well (lit.: may well-being be to you)" 3:3:4, and *p.* in the letters; *DN₁...DN₂ lū bēlū māmitīšu* "may DN₁...DN₆ be the lords of his oath" 4:157:49ff. It has the same function with stative verbs (i.e., it forms the jussive of the stative):³⁰⁵ e.g., *ašaršunū-mā-mi lū šabtū* "they (the borders) must remain in their very place" 3:7:15f.; *maḷa mūrakīši lū arik* "they (lit.: it) should be as wide as its (the measurement's) width" 4:194:12f.

Three times in one text, *lū* transforms a *dur.* into a (polite?) injunction:³⁰⁶ *ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tētenep-puššu* "You should treat him well, according to his rank" 4:193:10ff., 22ff.; *ana sisīšu šē tibna lū tattanaddin-ma* "You should constantly give his horses grain and straw" *ibid.*:15f. This injunctive *lū* is also used to strengthen *lā* in prohi-

³⁰⁴Cf. GAG §127d.

³⁰⁵Cf. GAG §81b.

³⁰⁶Cf. GAG §81e.

bitions; for examples, see the previous section, on negation.

Finally, in a non-injunctive function, *lū* precedes items in lists, with the meaning "whether...or":³⁰⁷ *lū ardu lū amtu* "whether male or female servant" 4:163:23'; cf. 4:127:5ff. (quoted above, p. 107, n. 288); 4:160:12'f.

7. Non-coordinating Enclitic -ma

The particle *-ma* may occur, as elsewhere in Akk., on words other than the verb, in a capacity other than that of connector.³⁰⁸ Generally, it is thought to impart some special emphasis to the word to which it is attached.³⁰⁹ In grammatical terms, it is most likely that enclitic *-ma*, when not used to coordinate clauses, serves to mark the logical predicate of a sentence, "the main point of a sentence when that element is not the verb."³¹⁰ This observation holds true for most of the examples of non-coordinating *-ma* in K: e.g., *mīnum-mē pāṭūka ša PN iškunakku*

³⁰⁷Cf. GAG §117c-d.

³⁰⁸In L: 3:7:15; 4:188:11,20; 4:193:20; in T: 4:153f.: 12,18,23; for 4:155:19, see n. 317, below; in J: 4:163:19', 25',29'; *AnOr*48:12:12. For 4:164:4; 4:165:2; 4:127:4; 4:121:2f.; 4:150:2; *AnOr*48:11:3,5, see the last paragraph of this section. For *-ma* as a conjunction (including its attachment to the sender of a letter, after *umma*), see below, pp. 117ff.

³⁰⁹Cf. GAG §123a.R.Patterson, "Old Babylonian Parataxis ..." (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1971), discusses this use of *-ma* on pp. 59f., 105ff.

³¹⁰Anson F. Rainey, "Enclitic *-ma* and the logical predicate in Old Babylonian," *IOS* 6 (1976), 51.

*ašaršunū-mā-mi*³¹¹ *lū šabtū* "Whatever your borders, which PN set up for you, it is in their (present) place that they must be maintained"³¹² 3:6:9ff.; *unūte ša itttišu ihal-liqū šalāšišu-ma(š-šū-ma)* *umalla* "It is threefold that he will repay the vessels that were lost with him" 4:153:10ff.³¹³ Obviously, the cleft sentence pattern that is used to indicate a non-verbal logical predicate in English is awkward at times,³¹⁴ and a simple emphatic rendering may be preferred: e.g., *u šumma ana mamma amīli šanīm-ma*³¹⁵ *ana šīmi nattadin-mi* "nor (oath formula) have we given to any other man for a price" 4:163:25', 29'. The translation must not obscure, however, the fact that *-ma* marks the logical predicate of the sentence.

³¹¹Note the *-mi* at the end of the word, indicating a direct quote. In K, *-mi* almost invariably goes with the predicate of the sentence; see above, p. 90.

³¹²*ašaršunū-mā-mi* here and *ašrašunū-ma* in 4:188:11 must be taken as adverbial acc.'s (of place); see below, p. 157.

³¹³In the same text, there occurs *u unūte ša itttišu ihalliqū mala ša ihalliqū qaqqadšunū-ma umalla* "and as for the vessels that were lost with him--it is the principal of them, as much as were lost, that they will make good" 4:154:15ff. *unūte ša itttišu ihalliqū* forms a *casus pendens*, for which see below, pp. 162f.

³¹⁴Cf. Rainey, *IOS* 6, p. 58.

³¹⁵The only other time *šanū* occurs in K, it again has *-ma*: *ina āli šanīm-ma ultāššibši* "In another city he made her dwell" *AnOr* 48:12:12. One wonders whether *šanū* always took *-ma* in this dialect; but, of course, three examples are not enough to generalize. In U, *šanū* is normally not followed by *-ma*: e.g., 3:114:20; 3:126:25; 5:5:3' (fem.); 5:11:11. In texts from Khatti, it usually has *-ma* (e.g., *PRU* 4:52:10, 15bis; *Ug.* 5:106:side, 2), but occasionally occurs alone (e.g., *PRU* 4:42:33).

In nominal sentences, the logical predicate will usually, though not always,³¹⁶ be the same as the grammatical predicate, and it too may be marked for emphasis with *-ma*: *mār šarrim-ma šūt* "He is the king's own son" 4:193:20f.; *mullâ akannâ-ma* "The fine is the same" 4:154:23.

There are, however, occurrences of non-coordinating *-ma* that do not fit the above comments. In two of them, *-ma* occurs on the verb, but is not a conjunction; one is: *appunâ-ma ana sisšēšū šē tibna lū tattanaddin-ma šumma attā ul tīdēšū ahūšū ša PN šūt* "Moreover you should constantly give his horses grain. In case you do not know him, he is PN's brother" 4:193:13ff. Here *šumma* clearly begins a new sentence, and so *-ma* must end the foregoing one. The other example is more blatant, since *-ma* ends a paragraph, a whole section of text: *u mārū GN...mullâ...umallūnim-ma* "and the citizens of GN... will pay the fine..." 4:157:42ff. The significance of *-ma* in these two cases remains obscure; emphasis seems an unlikely reason for its occurrence.

Another group of occurrences of *-ma* that does not fit the description of use given above is found in the introductions of the K legal texts. As elsewhere, these begin *ana panī RN* "in the presence of RN." The K examples always

³¹⁶vs. Rainey, *IOS* 6, 56. It is reasonable to assume that a question such as "Who is in the house?" could be answered with *šarrum-ma ina bīti* "(It is) the king (who) is in the house."

contain *-ma* somewhere in the genealogy, whenever one is given; the particle does not always appear in the same place in the genealogy, however. The passages all begin with *ana panē RN₁ šar GN*, and then continue as follows:

1. *mār RN₂ šar GN-ma mār-mārīšū ša RN₃ šar GN-ma qarrādi*³¹⁷
2. *mār RN₂ šar GN-ma mār-mārīšū ša RN₃ šar GN qarrādi*³¹⁸
3. *mār RN₂ šar GN mār-mārīšū ša RN₃ šar GN-ma qarrādi*³¹⁹
4. *mār RN₂ šar GN mār-mārīšū ša RN₃ šar GN-ma qarrādi u*
*ana panē RN₄ mār RN₅ šar GN*³²⁰

The K texts are the only ones in the Ras Shamra corpus to exhibit this feature. Elsewhere, it is attested in MA and NA genealogies, and seems to mean "also."³²¹

³¹⁷4:121:1ff.

³¹⁸4:165:1ff.

³¹⁹4:127:1ff.; 4:164:1ff.

³²⁰AnOr48:11:1ff.

³²¹AHW 569f. (*-ma* A. 2 b). If *-ma* occurs in 4:155:19, its nuance must remain obscure as long as the line itself is unclear: *šum-ma LÚ-ma UZU ka-a-ma i-ša-ba-tu₄-ni*, for which Nougayrol proposes: "Si les fils du Carkemiš trouve(?) ainsi (des) hommes(?)," noting (PRU 4, 155, n. 2) that LÚ UZU is otherwise unattested, and that in any case *šabātu* here is "maladroit." The line does not appear in the parallel paragraph, ll.36ff. Nougayrol's suggestion that the sense of LÚ UZU is probably "corpse" seems quite reasonable. I would offer, with much hesitation, a slight emendation, and read: *šum-ma LÚ-la'-am UG₇ ka-a-ma i-ša-ba-tu₄-ni* "and if they find(?) a dead man (*amēlam mēta*) in this way." Admittedly, mimation otherwise is not found explicitly written except on a few fixed expressions (see above, pp. 26f.).

8. Coordination of Clauses

Our discussion of clausal coordination, or parataxis, will refer in large part to the most thorough investigation of parataxis to date, that of R. Patterson on OB Hammurapi letters and the Code of Hammurapi.³²² Coordination of clauses in K may be accomplished by the particle *-ma*, by the conjunctions *u* "and," *u* "or," or *asyndetically*.

a. Coordination with *-ma*.

The particle *-ma* is used to coordinate clauses³²³ only sporadically in K. There are 14 examples in the treaties and legal texts, six in the letters (four in one letter alone).³²⁴ In OB, clauses joined by *-ma* are irreversible, that is, they cannot be put in the opposite order without

³²²Richard D. Patterson, "Old Babylonian Parataxis as Exhibited in the Royal Letters of the Middle Old Babylonian Period and in the Code of Hammurapi" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970); University Microfilms no. 71-14007.

³²³For *-ma* other than as a clause connector (i.e., as an "emphatic" particle), see above, 113ff. For *-ma* in coordination in MB, see Aro, *SMBG*, 136ff.

³²⁴In J: 4:161ff.:15',18',23',27'; 4:166:8; *4:189:17' 4:293:7'; cf. **4:171:8; in T: 4:156f.:31,37,44; 4:158f.:7,17 (also [22,28]); in 4:54:7(E); in L: 3:4a:9; 4:193:16; 5:95:29,33,38,50. The six occurrences in the letters do not include the ubiquitous *ana X qibē-ma* found in the beginning of each of the letters, as it is elsewhere in Akk. The interpretation of *-ma* in this expression is still debated, and beyond the scope of the present work; cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 100ff. For letter introductions in general in the texts found at Ras Shamra, see Nougayrol's comments in *PRU* 3, 2f., *Ug.* 5, 66f. In most OB letters, *-ma* also follows the name of the sender: *umma Y-ma* "thus (says) Y" (cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 100ff.); in K, this is the case only when the sender is identified simply as "the king," but always in such cases: 4:193; 5:103; *5:90; *5:108; cf. 4:54:1(Edict).

substantially altering the meaning of the sentence.³²⁵ The same can be said for all the occurrences of *-ma* in K. Some examples: *u anumma PN ātabak-ma ittalak* "I have hereby sent off PN, and he has gone" 3:3f.:8f.; *m̄num-mê ardī...* *šar GN līpahher-mā-mi ana RN litēr-mi* "Let the king of GN gather all the servants..., and return (them) to RN" 4:163:21'ff.; *mārū GN illakūnim-ma ina GN₂ ina māmītī itammūni* "The citizens of GN will come and swear by an oath in GN₂" 4:156:21f.

Often, the mood, even the tense, is the same in both clauses coordinated by *-ma*, as in the examples just cited. However, as in OB,³²⁶ it is possible for *-ma* to join clauses where the moods differ: e.g., in a sentence which occurs four times in 4:158ff., and which is almost identical to the last example of the preceding paragraph: [*mārū GN₁... illakūnim-ma*] *ina GN₂ litmū* "the citizens of GN₁ will come ...that they may swear in GN₂" 4:158ff.:28ff. (reconstructed on the basis of 11.6f., 13f., 22f.).

As in OB,³²⁷ *-ma* implies either (a) a sequence of events in the clauses it connects (e.g., 3:3f.:8f., 4:163:21'ff., above), or (b) the logical, or "undifferentiated,"³²⁸ subordination of the clause containing *-ma* to the following

³²⁵Patterson, "Parataxis," 45f., 114.

³²⁶Ibid., 50f., 73f.

³²⁷Ibid., chapter 3.

³²⁸Ibid., 86f.

clause. Thus, the last two examples quoted above (4:156:21f.; 4:158ff.:28ff.) could be translated as expressions of purpose (final clauses):³²⁹ "The citizens of GN will come to swear..." Another example is: *PN₁ qadu šībūtīšu litmā-ma PN₂ kasapšu lišallimšu* "Let PN₁ and his witnesses swear, so that PN₂ may/must repay him his silver" 5:95:32ff. The particle may also have an adversative nuance:³³⁰ *u sākinnu 5000 šiqil kaspa ilteqē-ma lā ittadinšu* "and the prefect took 5000 shekels of silver, but did not give {it} to him" (or: "Although the prefect took..., he did not give...") 4:166:8f. In all the instances where clauses are joined by *-ma*, it may be said that, as in OB,³³¹ the main stress of the sentence lies with the clause following the *-ma*, whereas the clause with *-ma* depicts a circumstance attendant to, or leading up to, the following clause.

There are two instances of *-ma* on verbs in which it does not act as a conjunction. These were quoted in the previous section (p. 115). Apart from these, however, *-ma* is used in K in the same manner as it is in OB. The essential difference is that it occurs far less frequently in K.

³²⁹Cf. *ibid.*, 70.

³³⁰Cf. *ibid.*, 80ff.

³³¹Cf. *ibid.*, 45f., 113.

b. Coordination with *u*.

By far the most common means of coordinating two clauses is to use the conjunctive particle *u* "and." *u* is also used in OB, though much less often than *-ma*.³³² Clauses joined by *u* in OB may be fully reversible, or, due to the nature of the words or the context involved, they may sometimes be irreversible.³³³ Examples of both possibilities are found in K. Clauses whose order could be reversed, e.g., are: *ina ekaḷli ša šar GN appūna lā elli u RN ahūši ittiša lā idabbub* "She may not go up, moreover, into the palace of the king of GN, and RN, her brother, may not speak with her" *AnOr*48:12:13ff.; *ardūya šunū-mi u ina tuppīya kanki šaṭrū-mi* "They are my servants, and are inscribed in my sealed tablet" 4:168:5f. Note also the frequent prohibition at the end of most legal texts: *PN₁ ...ana muhhi PN₂ lā iraggum u PN₂...ana muhhi PN₁ lā iraggum* "PN₁ may not contest against PN₂..., and PN₂ may not contest against PN₁..." e.g., 4:167:20ff.; 4:170:19ff. As examples of clauses in which the order could not be reversed without altering the meaning may be cited: *PN ittama u mārū GN ušallimū* "PN swore and (then) the citizens of GN repaid" 4:170:15ff.; *ina libbi bīt kēli iltakanšū-mi u ina libbi bīt [kēli] imtūt-mi* "He put him in prison, and he died in

³³²Cf. *ibid.*, 19f.

³³³*Ibid.*, 33ff.

prison" 6:36:6ff.

In OB, clauses connected by *u* must always contain predicates of the same mood (i.e., indicative or injunctive).³³⁴ This is true in most of the cases in K (note, e.g., all of the preceding examples). However, there are exceptions: e.g., *u šarru mullā ana muhhi PN šalāššū il-takan u mullā šalāššū limalli* "and the king imposed on him a fine of three-fold compensation, and (or: with the result that) he must pay a fine of three-fold compensation" 4:179:9ff. Here, *-ma* would be expected in native Akk. (at least, as represented by the OB of Hammurapi³³⁵), but its place has been taken by *u*. As noted above, in OB material, when *-ma* connects two clauses, the emphasis is always on the second one. In that same corpus, clauses connected by *u* bear equal emphasis.³³⁶ This too often holds true in K; but, as the last example quoted shows, the emphasis (or "thought stress"³³⁷) is sometimes clearly directed toward the second clause only. As another illustration, note: *anumma PN₁ itti PN₂ illakūnikku u pāṭika išakkan(n)ūnikku* "Now then PN₁ and PN₂ are coming to you in order to (re-) establish your borders for you" 3:7:19ff. Here too, *-ma*

³³⁴Ibid., 32f., 42.

³³⁵Ibid., 114 (rule *-ma* 2).

³³⁶Ibid., 39f., 43.

³³⁷Ibid., 17.

would be used in OB.

The observations in the above paragraphs may be summarized as follows: *-ma* as a coordinator is almost always used in K as it is in native Akk.; however, it occurs far less frequently in K; *u* is often used as it is in Akk.; however, it also often occurs in K where *-ma* would be expected in Akk.³³⁸ For this reason, the ratio of the number of times *-ma* is found relative to *u* is far smaller in K than in native Akk. That *u* so often displaces *-ma* is probably due to WS influence, especially since other examples of WS-type usage of *u* (for **wa-*) will be pointed out in the following paragraphs.

In the last passage quoted above (3:7:19ff.), *u* has replaced what would be *-ma* in a native Akk. text. A similar, but much clearer, example of WS syntax, in which more than the conjunction is non-Akk., is found in the following:

*kī maṣī-mē [ṣāb]ī narkabāt[ī ṣa an]la muhḫīka iṣtu ekalli
iltaknū ṣūšir u ṣamšī minūta eppaš* "Prepare as many troops
(and) chariots as have been established for you by the palace, so that my Sun may take a count" 4:192:10ff. To express purpose in Akk., the construction here would be: imper. + *-ma* + prec.³³⁹ In the example, however, the con-

³³⁸Since more texts lack *-ma* entirely than contain it, it is possible that many K scribes were unfamiliar with its use, and therefore did not employ it at all, using instead only *u*.

³³⁹Cf. GAG §158f.

struction is closer to that used in Hebrew, namely, imper.
+ wə- + jussive (short imperfect).³⁴⁰

One very frequent, and quite un-Akk., use of *u* in K is to introduce new sentences, and even new paragraphs. This is especially common in the letters. Consider the following: *ahūšu ša PN šūt mār šarrim-ma šūt u ištu zittīšu kī ṭābiš lū tēteneppušū* "He is PN's brother; he is the king's own son. So treat him well, according to his rank" 4:193:19ff.; *u sākinnu 5000 šiqil kaspā ilteqē-ma lā itta-dinšu u šarru PN aššum 4920 šiqil kaspi...ana māmīti itta-dinšu* "And the prefect took 5000 shekels of silver, but did not give (it) to him. And the king put him under oath about the 4920 shekels of silver..." 4:166f.:8ff. A test for this use of *u* (i.e., to determine that it is not coordinating two clauses) might be the possibility of substituting a sentence-initial adverb like *anumma* or *inanna* without altering the meaning of the text. This is in fact possible in the examples just given. In some cases, *u* occurs, redundantly it seems, along with *anumma* at the beginning of a paragraph; the following illustration, although rather long, is best quoted in full: *aššum pāṭṭika ša taš-pura mīnum-mē pāṭṭika ša PN₁ iškunakku ašrašunū-ma lū ṣabtū mamma lā unakkaršunūti u anumma PN₂ u PN₃ altapraṭṭku*³⁴¹

³⁴⁰Cf. Joñon, *GHB* §116d, p. 316. Occasionally, even the regular imperfect is used, as the Akk. dur. is here: e.g., *paqaḥ-nā' 'et-ʿēnāw wə-yīr'eh* "Open his eyes, that he may see" 2Kings 6:17.

³⁴¹For this restoration, see above, p. 56, n. 128.

u pāṭī šāšunu išakkanūnikku "Concerning your borders, about which you wrote me: whatever borders of yours, which PN₁ established for you, must be held in their very place. No one may change them. Also, I hereby send PN₂ and PN₃ to you, to (re-)establish those borders for you" 4:188:6ff. In this example,³⁴² the occurrence of *u* is clearly non-Akk., but would not be surprising in a WS dialect.³⁴³

Another use of *u* that is not found in native Akk. texts is to introduce the apodosis in conditional sentences in which the protasis is begun by *šumma*.³⁴⁴ This occurs in nearly half the examples, and does not seem to add anything to the meaning of the sentence. In fact, some texts have examples of conditional sentences both with and without *u* to connect the two clauses; compare, e.g., *u šumma tamkārū ...iddakkū*³⁴⁵ *u dāikūšunu iššabbatūni mārū GN...ušallamūni* "and if traders...are murdered, and their murderers are caught, the citizens of GN will pay..." 4:156f.:28ff., but *u šumma dāikūšunu lā iššabbatū u mārū GN illakūnim-ma...*

³⁴²Other examples are: 3:3:8f.; *5:109:r11'f.

³⁴³Cf. Hebrew, where *wə-* may begin whole books (e.g., *way-yiqra'* Leviticus 1:1).

³⁴⁴Cf. GAG §161; Patterson, "Parataxis," 41, n. 39. This phenomenon is also encountered in U (see below, p. 328), at Boghazkoy (cf. Labat, *AkkBo*, 78), Nuzi (cf. Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 47; Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*, p. 52), Alalakh (cf. Giacomakis, *AkkAL*, 63), Mari (cf. Finet, *ALM*, 240), Byblos (cf. Moran, "Byblos," 71ff.). For conditional clauses in general, see below, pp. 129ff.

³⁴⁵On this form, see below, p. 131, n. 368.

itammi "but if their murderers are not caught, the citizens of GN will come...to swear" *ibid.*:36ff. The similarity of this use of *u* to the so-called *waw* of apodosis in Hebrew is obvious,³⁴⁶ and it is almost certain that we have here another instance of WS influence.

Related to the occurrence of *u* to introduce the apodosis of a conditional sentence, is its use to introduce a main clause after a subordinate clause.³⁴⁷ This occurs four times (three in letters) out of seven examples,³⁴⁸ and is probably also a WS feature,³⁴⁹ since it is not normal Akk. usage.

Finally, consider the following series of clauses:
 400 *kaspu ana muhhi PN...hubbul-mi u kaspu [š]a muhhišu uttahir-mi danniš [u] šar GN 400 kaspa [š]âšu mithâriš ana muhhi PN₂ iltakan-mi u 200 kaspa ittannam-mi u 600 kaspu ana muhhišu irtêh-mi* "400 silver was owed by PN₁; and the silver which he owed was greatly in arrears; and the king of GN imposed that 400 silver on PN₂ at the same time; and he has given me 200 silver; and 600 silver (still) remain against him" 5;94:8ff. Of course, the clauses could be put into smoother, more idiomatic English; but the translation given brings the point to the fore: there are five

³⁴⁶Cf. Jøton, *GHB* §176d, p. 531.

³⁴⁷See below, pp. 138ff., on subordinate clauses, for examples.

³⁴⁸Twice after *undu*, possibly an adverb in K; see p. 140.

³⁴⁹Cf. Jøton, *GHB* §176e-i, pp. 531f.

successive clauses connected by *u*. A native Akk. scribe, even if he wished to use *u*, would not use it four times in a row; the first three would be deleted.³⁵⁰ It is almost as unlikely that an Akk. writer would connect five clauses in succession with *-ma* (although it is presumably not impossible or unknown); some variation would normally occur, such as beginning a new sentence at some point, or using subordinate clauses. The above sequence of clauses, then, is in all probability to be compared with the long sequences, all connected by **wa-*, that occur in WS dialects.

We have seen, therefore, that in addition to some examples in which *u* reflects normal Akk. usage, there are other occasions on which *u* is used where *-ma* is expected. That this is probably to be attributed to WS influence is argued by several other uses of *u* that reflect the use of WS **wa-*, where normal Akk. would have no conjunction.

c. Coordination with *-ma u*.

In one instance, two clauses are coordinated by *-ma u*:
šarrat GN₁ zittašunu...tittadin-ma u ina GN₂ tultellīšunūti
u...māmīta ina berīšunu taltakan "The queen of GN₁ gave
 (them) their share..., and then sent them up to GN₂, and
 imposed an oath between them" 4:121f.:9ff. In OB, *-ma u*
 occurs sporadically, always in irreversible sequences, and
 with the meaning "and also, and then."³⁵¹ The sole K exam-

³⁵⁰Patterson, "Parataxis," 185.

³⁵¹Ibid., 117ff.; for MB, see Aro, *SMBG*, 143.

ple would seem to fit these observations as well. At any rate, *-ma u* had not become a frequent conjunction in K, as it had, e.g., in Nuzi.³⁵² Note that the order of the clauses could be reversed around the conjunction *u* in the passage above; i.e., the clause after *u* (with *taltakan*) could precede the other two, with no change in meaning. The clauses connected by *-ma u*, however, could not be inverted.

d. Coordination with *ū*.

Although the conjunction *ū* "or" is written the same as *u* "and" (i.e., *ū*), it is possible to isolate a few likely occurrences of it. Most often it coordinates two oath formulas, which are in effect protases of unfinished conditional sentences:³⁵³ e.g., *šumma karānīšunu nēnu nakkis-mi ū šumma amīlī ša karānīšumu ikkisū nīdē-mi* "we did not tear down their vineyards, nor do we know the men who tore down their vineyards" 4:162:9'f.³⁵⁴ In one case, the conjunction is strengthened by the addition of *šumma*:³⁵⁵ *terrašunūtī-mi ū šumma pūhī ardīya idnam-mi* "Return them to me, or else give me substitutes for my servants" 4:168:5f. As Patterson notes, clauses connected by *ū* are by the very nature of the conjunction always fully reversible, and contain the same

³⁵²Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*, pp. 50ff.

³⁵³The form of the oath is considered below, pp. 160f.

³⁵⁴Cf. also 4:162f.17'ff., 24'f., 28f.'.

mood;³⁵⁵ this is as true in K as it is in OB. Note that there are no occurrences of *ū lū* in K.³⁵⁶

One protasis consists of three protases joined by *yānum-mā* "if not, or else":³⁵⁷ *šumma RN...itti FN...idab-bub i-ia-nu-ma-a ina ekallīšu utārši i-ia-nu-ma-a...RN...dīna mimmaigerre* "if RN...speaks with FN..., or else returns her to his palace, or if...RN...starts a lawsuit" *AnOr*48:12:17ff.

e. Asyndetic Coordination.

Clauses can also be connected asyndetically in K. Patterson notes that "virtually every type of structure used with the coordinators *u* and *-ma* can be duplicated asyndetically," except when there is a variation of mood in the clauses.³⁵⁸ Although there are relatively few instances of true asyndetic coordination in K,³⁵⁹ the examples that do occur suggest that Patterson's observations apply here as well. A few examples will serve to illustrate this: *anumma PN...īllakakku ḡābīka u narkabātīka immar* "Now then PN...is coming to you to inspect your troops and chariots" 4:192:6ff.; *arad PN lutammām-mi akanna liqbi* "Let

³⁵⁵Patterson, "Parataxis," 127.

³⁵⁶Cf. *GAG* §171c; Patterson, "Parataxis," 122ff.

³⁵⁷Cf. *CAD* I/J, 324b.

³⁵⁸"Parataxis," 161, and n. 75.

³⁵⁹Perhaps this is another WS feature.

me adjure PN's servant, that he say as follows" 3:7:14ff.;
*u šar GN ištu lēt PN...iptaṭaršu ana arḏutti ša šar GN ir-
 tēh* "and since the king of GN has ransomed him from PN...
 he belongs to the service of the king of GN" 4:165:5ff.

9. Subordination

a. Conditional Sentences.

These are very common, especially (and naturally) in the treaties and legal documents. They are all introduced by the particle *šumma*; I can find no clear examples of unmarked conditional sentences anywhere in K.

When the protasis consists of more than one clause, those clauses are usually joined by *u*:³⁶⁰ e.g., *u šumma tamkāru...iddakkū*³⁶¹ *u dāikūšunu iṣṣabbatūni* "and if traders...are murdered, and their murderers are caught" 4:156:28ff.³⁶² In one instance, however, *šumma* is repeated instead: *šumma amīlu ša GN...iddāk šumma ša idūkūšu iṣabbatū* "if a man of GN...is murdered, and (lit.: if) they catch the one who murdered him" 4:153:4ff. In another case, *šumma* is repeated within the same clause, probably for clarity, although the result grammatically is anacoluthon:

³⁶⁰No examples with *-ma* occur.

³⁶¹For the interpretation of *i-da-ku* as N dur., see below, p. 131, n. 368.

³⁶²Cf., in the same text, 4:155:19f., and 6ff. (where *-mē--* or perhaps simply *-mī--* is attached to *šumma*; see above, p. 89f; see also 4:158f.:3ff., 20f.; 4:55:16ff.

šumma tuppa kanku ša hepû šumma ša X kaspi šû "if the sealed tablet which was broken--if it was the one of X silver" 4:177:17ff. In one protasis, consisting of three disjunctive clauses, the second and third alternatives are introduced by *yānum-mā*. The sentence, in *AnOr*48:12:17ff., was quoted above, p. 128.

It was noted above (pp. 124f.) that the apodosis in nearly half the conditional clauses begins with *u*, and that this "*u* of apodosis" does not have any perceptible impact on the meaning of the sentence.

There is one passage in which the apodosis has been omitted through ellipsis: *šumma atta ul tīdēšû ahûšû ša PN šût* "If you do not know him (, I will tell you:) he is PN's brother" 4:193:17ff.

When an action, the potential occurrence of which is being described, is seen as taking place in the future (i.e., as not having occurred yet), the verb of the protasis is *dur.* or stative. The only example of the latter is in fact a "preformative stative" of *edû*,³⁶³ in 4:193:17ff., quoted in the previous paragraph. There are many examples of the *dur.*: e.g., *šumma PN ištu māmīti inahhis* "if PN shrinks back from the oath" 4:177:25f.; *šumma RN₁ itti RN₂ lā inak-kir u amāte ša aqbû lā eppuš* "if RN₁ is not hostile to RN₂ and does not do the things I have said" 4:55:16ff.; cf. also all the examples with verbal protases quoted above. In the

³⁶³I.e., formally a pret.; cf. *GAG* §78b.

last example, the verb in the relative clause, *aqbû*, is pret., since it is describing an action that took place in the past; but the main verbs are dur. Conditional sentences in K therefore differ from OB, where the verb of the protasis is usually pret.,³⁶⁴ and also from MB, where the perf. predominates.³⁶⁵ In both OB and MB, the dur. is also used, but only to express intention or a wish (OB³⁶⁶), or, apparently, only with verbs that naturally express such notions (MB³⁶⁷). But in K, it is evident that no such nuances are implied; the fact that there are no exceptions³⁶⁸ makes the rule a very simple one: if the potential action is future, the dur. (or stative) is used.

The apodosis of such sentences is also normally dur.:

³⁶⁴GAG §161d.

³⁶⁵Aro, *SMBG*, 144f.

³⁶⁶GAG §161i.

³⁶⁷Aro, *SMBG*, 145.

³⁶⁸The writing *i-du-ku-mî* in 4:155:8 (and *i-du-ku-ni* in 4:159:21) could be pret. However, besides the fact that it would then constitute the only exception to the use of the dur. (or stative) in a future protasis, two other factors argue for considering the form to be dur. (*iddukkû*): (a) the verb of the second clause of the protasis here is a dur.: *iṣ-ṣa-ba-tuḡ-mi* (N: *iṣṣabbatû-mi*); (b) in a similar context, another text has *id-da-a-ak* (*iddāk*; N dur.) 4:153f.:6,22. The form *i-da-ku* in 4:156:29 should probably also be seen as N dur. (*iddakkû*). Both of these variants of the N dur. of verbs II-*w* are known elsewhere, although they occur in widely different periods; GAG §104v lists *izzazzû* (*zāzu* 3mp) in SB, while the *Ergänzungsheft* to GAG §104v lists *izzuzzû* (3ms subjunctive) in OB. Of course, the possibility of a scribal error in the case of either *i-du-ku* or *i-da-ku* cannot be ruled out.

e.g., *šumma iraggum tuppū annū ile''ēši* "If she contests, this tablet will defeat her" 4:208:9f., and often. Quite often, however, the prec. is found: e.g., *u šumma mārū GN₁ ištu māmīti inahhisū mullā šalāšīšu ana mārī GN₂ lišallimū* "And if the citizens of GN₁ shrink back from the oath, they must pay a fine threefold to the citizens of GN₂" 4:162:5'f.³⁶⁹ There seems to be little, if any, difference in such cases between the prec. and the dur. in the apodoses. Compare, e.g., the last example with: *u šumma PN ištu māmīti inahhis kaspā...PN ana šar GN umalla* "And if PN shrinks back from the oath, PN will make good the silver...to the king of GN" 4:177:25ff.³⁷⁰ Obviously, the translations "must" for the prec., and "will" for the dur., are merely traditional, and, in these cases, quite contrived, for any difference between the two, if one existed, cannot be discerned. It seems, then, that the dur. could have an injunctive force, at least, in apodoses.

One example of the perf. in the protasis occurs, but there the action has already occurred; i.e., it is an action in the past: *šumma asīru annū X kaspā ilteqe [š]la PN qāt līlī-mi* "If this prisoner has taken the silver, PN must renounce (any) claim"³⁷¹ 3:8:28ff. Thus, the difference be-

³⁶⁹Cf. also 3:8:27ff.; 4:159:20ff., 27ff.; 5:94f.:24ff., 30ff.

³⁷⁰Note that 4:161ff., the text of the previous example, has as its apodosis *kī šarrāqi mullā umalla* "he will make good the fine like a(ny) thief" 4:31'.

³⁷¹For this rendering, see above, pp. 45f.

tween native Bab. and K with regard to which tenses are used in the protasis is substantial.

There are only two examples of protases that are nominal clauses: 4:177:17ff., in which *šumma* is repeated, quoted above (p. 130, top), and another from the same text: *u šumma ša kaspi ša PN₁ šū u kaspu šāšu PN₂ ú-šal-LIM* "But if it is the one (i.e., the tablet) of PN₁'s silver, then PN₂ will repay that silver" *ibid.*:19ff. The verb of the apodosis is problematic: the dur. is expected. The *LIM* sign is most likely a scribal error.³⁷² Another difficult conditional sentence, still in the same text, is: *šumma PN itamma u X KÙ.BABBAR PN ilteqe šalim l.23ff.* The problem is: Where does the apodosis begin? Nougayrol's translation is not quite sound grammatically: "Si [PN] jure (pour) les [X] d'argent qu'il a pris, il est quitte." The *u* must introduce either a second clause in the protasis, or the apodosis. Now, what PN is to swear is mentioned in the previous sentence: *u kaspa ša 400 imēri ša idabbubu PN litma (l.22f.)*, which must be rendered: "And (so), let PN swear about the silver of the 400 asses about which he was speaking."³⁷³ This makes it more likely that *šumma PN itamma in l.23f.* comprises the entire protasis of the sentence in

³⁷²It is unlikely that *LIM* is to be read *lam₅*; *AS³* no. 261 (pp. 51 and 7*) gives this value only infrequently, for OA and OB.

³⁷³Nougayrol has: "(Sentence:) Que [PN] jure (que la tablette brisée) (est bien) celle des 400 ânes en question!" This is unlikely, both grammatically and contextually.

question, and that *u* begins the apodosis. I would suggest, therefore, that *X KÙ.BABBAR PN ilteqe* is a *bīt īpušu* construction (without subjunctive),³⁷⁴ and that the whole sentence should be translated: "If PN swears, then the X silver PN took is clear (paid)."³⁷⁵

In one instance (4:54:12f.), the verb of the protasis, which has a sg. subject, is either in the subjunctive, or pl., for no apparent reason; see above, pp. 62f. Another, less likely instance (4:163:30'), was cited above, p. 108.

The negative in the protasis is always *lā* in the treaties, but *u* in the only example from the letters; see above, p. 111, for examples. No examples occur in the legal texts.

b. Relative Clauses.³⁷⁶

There are very few relative clauses that begin other than with *ša*. In one, *mīnum-mē* functions as a general relative pronoun:³⁷⁷ *mīnum-mē ardū ša RN lū ardu lū amtu ina*

³⁷⁴It must be pointed out, however, that no certain *bīt īpušu* constructions occur otherwise in K, although there may be one in 5:103:6ff.; see above, p. 88, and n. 222. Although the subjunctive usually appears where expected in the legal texts, there are number of instances where it is lacking; see above, pp. 61f.

³⁷⁵For this meaning of *šalāmu*, with inanimate subject, see AHw, 1144a (*šalāmu* G 3).

³⁷⁶On the occurrence or lack of the subjunctive in K, see above, pp. 60ff.

³⁷⁷Cf. the similar use of *mimma* in native Akk., noted in GAG §168d.

GN *ašbū-mi* "Whatever servants of RN, whether male or female, live in GN" 4:163:21'f. But in two other examples, one almost exactly the same as the last, *mīnum-mē* plus a noun phrase serve as antecedent to *ša*: *ibid.*:26'f.; 4:188:8ff., both quoted above, p. 39.

Two other relative clauses without *ša* (both *bīt īpušu* constructions) have been proposed in preceding sections: *kī mašī-mē n[arkabā]t šamšu iqtab[ū]* "however many chariots the Sun has commanded" 5:103:6f. (see above, p. 88, and n. 222); and *u X kasap PN ilteqe šalim* "then the X silver PN took is clear (paid)" 4:177:24f. (see pp. 133f.).

In relative clauses with *ša*, the determinative pronoun may occur without an antecedent; the resulting noun clause may be the object of a verb: e.g., *šumma ša idūkūšu iṣab-batū* "if they catch the one who killed him" 4:153:7f., cf. 13f. No examples occur in which the clause is the subject of a verb, undoubtedly by coincidence. In the following, the relative clause is the predicate of a nominal sentence: *ša kaspi ša PN šū* "it is the one (i.e., the tablet) of PN's silver" 4:177:19f.

Most often, there is an antecedent, which *ša* follows immediately:³⁷⁸ e.g., *ša tamkāri šāšu ša ina GN dīku* "of that trader, who was murdered in GN" 4:170:13f.; etc. In one instance, however, the relative clause is separated from its

³⁷⁸That is, it follows the antecedent with and all its other modifiers; see above, pp. 104f.

antecedent noun by an adverbial predicate, presumably for the sake of greater clarity: *aššum dīni sinništī ša mutši itti PN ša ina GN idūkū* "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was with PN, who (referring to the husband)³⁷⁹ was murdered in GN" 5:95:40ff.

The relative clause may be verbal, as in *ša aqbū*³⁸⁰ "which I said" 4:55:18, or nominal, as in *ša itti arad PN* "who is with PN's servant 5:94:6. In two cases of the latter type, in which the predicates are prepositional phrases, the preposition has been deleted after *ša*: *kaspu [š]a*³⁸¹ *muhhīšū* "the silver which he owes" 5:94:11; *ša libbi GN ašbū* "who live in GN" 4:163:26'. There are no prepositional phrases modifying nouns in K (e.g., "the book on the table");³⁸² all such relationships are expressed by nominal

³⁷⁹It is clear from the rest of the context that the woman's husband was killed; however, it is also clear that PN too was killed. Thus, it is possible that the relative clause refers to PN, in which case it conforms to normal grammar in coming directly after its antecedent. Another possibility is that the second *ša* is otiose, and that the lines quoted mean: "concerning the case of the woman whose husband was murdered along with PN in GN." This is Nougayrol's interpretation ("dont on a tué le mari à [GN] avec [PN]"). Note, however, that there are no other instances of otiose *ša* in K (it does occur in U; see below, p. 335).

³⁸⁰The past tense in relative clauses is usually expressed by the pret.; however, the perf. does occur occasionally; see below, pp. 142f.

³⁸¹For this reading, see above, p. 81, n. 202.

³⁸²Such constructions are common in U legal texts; see below, p. 334. In K, even *kirī karāntiya ina GN ittaksū-mi* 5:95:36f. is probably not "My orchard (which is) in GN they tore down," but rather "In GN, they tore down my orchard" (i.e., the prepositional phrase modifies the verb).

relative clauses, such as the three just cited (i.e., "the book which is on the table").

The relative pronoun may represent the subject of its clause: e.g., *ša hepû* "which was broken" 4:177:18; or the direct object: e.g., *ša ihpû* "which he broke" *ibid.*:15. Presumably, when it represented the direct object, it could be resumed by a pronominal suffix on the verb, as is possible even in main clauses;³⁸³ however, no examples occur. When *ša* represents a noun whose relationship to the subordinate verb is other than subject or object, it must, as is normal in Akk., still stand first, and be resumed by a pronoun elsewhere in the clause;³⁸⁴ that is, it may not be governed by a preposition. Only one such example is attested: *sinništī ša mutši itti PN* "of the woman whose husband was with PN" 5:95:40f.

There are no instances in which *ša* governs more than one clause. In the only case where such an opportunity arises, *ša* is (probably) repeated: *ša ištu [kakkīšlu(?) ileqqû u [ša] ina mātīšu...irrubû* "those whom he takes with(?) his weapons(?), and who enter his land..." 4:54:9ff.

No examples occur in K in which *ša* means "that," i.e., introduces a clause as object of a verb of knowing, speaking, etc.³⁸⁵

³⁸³Resumptive pronouns are discussed below, pp. 158f.

³⁸⁴*GAG* §165c.

³⁸⁵Cf. *GAG* §177d.

c. Other Subordinate Clauses.³⁸⁶

These are rare in K;³⁸⁷ they seem to be so uncommon with respect to native Akk., that one wonders whether some substrate influence is at work, from a dialect (WS?) that preferred "logical" or "undifferentiated" subordination, by means of coordination, to grammatical subordination.³⁸⁸

In all the examples, the subordinate clause precedes the main clause. Of seven instances where the texts is not broken, the main clause is introduced by *u* four times (three in the letters):³⁸⁹ e.g., *u kīmē iqta[bū] mā...u ittahna[q]* "and when they said..., he hanged himself" *5:109:8ff.; without *u*: *kī ša ahhūšunu iqabbūni akanna ušallamūni* "According as their brothers say, so they will repay" 4:155f.: 10f., 32f.

The subordinate clauses found in K may be grouped into two general types: temporal and comparative. One example of each was quoted in the preceding paragraph. For the latter type, note also: *u kī mullā mārū GN ana PN umtallū u ana sinništi š[āšī] mullā an[a muttēši(?) ...]*³⁹⁰ "then

³⁸⁶The occurrence of the subjunctive is discussed above, pp. 60ff.

³⁸⁷All the examples will be cited in the paragraphs below.

³⁸⁸Cf. pp. 118f., above.

³⁸⁹This use of *u* is probably due to WS influence; cf. p. 125, above.

³⁹⁰p.-R. Berger, in *UF* 2, 287, restores [u]-[ū]-[m]ā-l-[li-ni-ši]. This creates a unique, and uniquely incorrect,

just as the citizens of GN paid a fine for PN, (they will pay?) that woman a fine for her husband(?)" 5:95:53ff.

There seems to be no difference in meaning between *kī* and *kī ša*.³⁹¹ Note that *kī (ša)* is used both times in clauses of comparison, whereas *kīmē* introduces a temporal clause.³⁹² These examples are too few, however, to conclude that this was a general rule in K, an unlikely situation considering the ranges of use that both exhibit elsewhere.³⁹³

Another temporal clause is: *šumma...lām anāku ina GN egerrebu atta RN tahabbat!-ma*³⁹⁴ "if...before I approach GN, you, RN, advance..." 4:54:3ff.³⁹⁵

The originally Hurrian adverb *undu*³⁹⁶ appears to be used as a temporal conjunction, meaning "when," in its two

form, and in any case, it does not fit the traces as well as well as Nougayrol's proposed *ū(?)-[a]l(?)-[la]l(?)-[a]l*. The general sense is clear, at least, regardless of the reading.

³⁹¹Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 154; *GAG* §178f.

³⁹²*kīmē* occurs one other time, in a broken passage: *u kīmē nukurtu ša GN [iggammar(u)]* "and when the war with GN is finished" 4:151:11. Again, *kīmē* has a temporal meaning.

³⁹³Cf., e.g., *AHW*, 469 (*kī C*), 478a (*kīmē*). Note that the latter occurs only in peripheral Akk. For enclitic *-mē*, see above, pp. 87ff.

³⁹⁴The text has *ah-ta-ba-at-m[a]* cf. p. 63, n. 155.

³⁹⁵Cf. also, in **4:197:14f.: *adi [ašrānu(?)] ašib [(u) kī] ṭābi(š) dugulšu* "As long as he remains there(?), regard him well." In the copy, there is enough room for *ū ki-i*, but Nougayrol restores only *ki-i*.

³⁹⁶Cf. E.A. Speiser, *Introduction to Hurrian*, *AASOR* XX (New Haven, American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941), 89f.; Bush, "Hurrian," 240f.

occurrences in K.³⁹⁷ In both cases, the main clause is introduced by *u*; in the first, the verb has the ventive ending: *undu mār šīprīka aššum arad PN₁ tašpura u hubtanlānu(?) ša PN₂ u PN₁...iptaṭaršu* "When you sent me your messenger concerning PN₁'s servant, the ...(?) of PN₂ and PN₁...ransomed him" 3:7:5ff.; in the second text, 4:54f., the verb lacks the subjunctive *-u*, even though it occurs elsewhere in the text where expected (11.6,18): *undu šar GN ittīya ikkir u ana RN akanna altapar* "When the king of GN was at war with me, I wrote to RN as follows" 11.1ff. In both of these passages, it would be possible to consider *undu* an introductory adverb, "now then," or the like, as it is in Hurrian: "Now then you sent..., and"; "Now then...was at war..., and." However, its use elsewhere in Akk. would argue against this interpretation.³⁹⁸

A similar situation is encountered with *enūma*, which occurs five times in K, always in the letters.³⁹⁹ It sometimes occurs in simple sentences: e.g., *enūma PN imtahranni ma ...* "...PN approached me (saying:)..." 5:95:35f. In

³⁹⁷*undu* occurs almost exclusively in WPA. It is apparently a conjunction in the material from Boghazkoy (see Labat, *AkkBo*, 226); from Nuzi (Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 229); from Amarna (EA II, 1425, 1539--texts from Assyria, Boghazkoy, Mittanni, Byblos, Beirut). For examples in U, see below, pp. 337f.

³⁹⁸See the previous note.

³⁹⁹3:3:6; 3:8:25; 4:193:5; 5:95:35; *5:90:6; cf. also **4:196:8. Rather than Nougayrol's [*e-nu-ma*] at the beginning of 4:151:13, [ḫ] should probably be restored.

compound sentences, the second clause is always introduced by *u*, and *enūma* is never followed by the subjunctive.⁴⁰⁰ These facts point to the conclusion that *enūma* is not a conjunction in K, but rather a sentence-initial adverb, meaning something like "now then."⁴⁰¹ Other examples are: *enūma hapīr[ū] ittīya ul ašbū u anumma PN ātabak-ma ittālak* "Now then, the Hapiru are not living with me; and I have just sent PN off, and he has gone" 3:3:6ff.; *enūma PN ašrānu... illaka u atta ištu zittīšu kī tābiš lū tētenepuššu* "Now then, PN is coming there..., and you must treat him well, according to his rank" 4:193:6ff.

For action in the past in subordinate clauses, it seems that either the pret. or the perf. could be used (see the examples); no difference in nuance is discernible. For incompleted action (either present or future time), the dur. is of course employed.⁴⁰²

No subordinate Clauses with negatives occur.

10. *The Use of the Tenses*

a. Preterite and Perfect.

In MB letters, according to Aro, the pret. is used to express action in the past only in subordinate clauses, and

⁴⁰⁰It must be pointed out, however, that in the letters, the subjunctive is not common; see above, p. 60.

⁴⁰¹Cf. CAD I/J, 158b; AHw, 384a (*inūma* C).

⁴⁰²On the use of the tenses in general, see the next section.

negated and interrogative main clauses, while in positive assertions, the perf. is used.⁴⁰³ In legal texts and *ku-durru*'s, on the other hand, the pret. is the regular form for the past in all circumstances. In all the text types, finally, there are numerous exceptions to these generalizations.

In the K texts, a situation quite similar to MB exists, although a few differences do present themselves. We will examine the range of occurrences of the two forms separately, for greater clarity. But first, it should be noted that both forms are used only for completed action in the past.

The pret. is the normal tense in relative clauses, occurring 15 out of 20 times for past action.⁴⁰⁴ Thus, e.g., while *nadānu* in main clauses is always in the perf. for past action (over ten times⁴⁰⁵), in the only relative clause in which it occurs, it is pret.: *ša ana šīmi iddinū* "which they gave for a price" 4:161:30'. Similarly, *epēšu* occurs four times in the perf., always in main clauses;⁴⁰⁶ but in a relative clause: *ša ina libbi GN mārāt RN...ēpušu* "which

⁴⁰³*SMDG*, 80ff.; cf. *GAG* §§79,80.

⁴⁰⁴With the pret.: 3:3f.:6,11; 3:6:8; 3:8:24; 4:55:18; 4:127:9f.; 4:162f.:2'f,3'f.,10',30'; 4:176:15; 5:94f.:7,43; 5:103:5,10; note that nine of these are *ša tašpura*. With the perf.: 4:192:12ff.; 4:209:5f.; 5:95:49; also, if the unmarked relative clauses proposed above (see p. 135) are correct, 4:177:24; 5:103:6ff. *i-du-ku(-šu)* in 4:153:7,13; 5:95:42 could be either pret. or perf.

⁴⁰⁵E.g., 4:167:9,17; 4:168:12; 5:94:15.

⁴⁰⁶4:176:8,11; *5:90:11; *5:109:13.

the daughter of RN...acquired in GN" 4:127:9f. The same may be noted for a number of other verbs as well.⁴⁰⁷ The instances in which the perf. occurs in relative clauses must simply be labelled exceptions to the general rule.

Another circumstance in which the pret. is found regularly is the first clauses of many of the legal dockets. In very general terms, a K legal text has the following format (there are many variations, deletions of clauses, and so on):

<i>ana panē RN</i> (± genealogy)	In the presence of RN...;
<i>PN₁ u/ittti PN₂ ana dīni</i> <i>isniqū</i> ⁴⁰⁸	PN ₁ and PN ₂ approached for a judgment;
<i>PN₁ iqbi</i> (plus quote) ⁴⁰⁹	PN ₁ said...;
(<i>PN₂ iqbi</i> (plus quote)) ⁴⁰⁹	(PN ₂ said...);
further statements, <i>pret.</i>	further evidence;
<i>šarru akanna iprus</i> , plus injunction(s)	The king decided as follows...;
(<i>inanna</i>) one or more clauses, verb(s) <i>perf.</i> , describing action taken due to king's decision	(now)...result(s) of decision;
<i>ina arki ūmi...</i>	prohibitions and condi- tions regarding fu- ture litigation.

⁴⁰⁷E.g., *šakānu*: always perf. in main clauses (e.g., 5:94:14; 4:179:10), but twice pret. in relative clauses (3:7:17; 4:188:10; but once perf.: 4:192:14); *nakāsu*: *ittak-sū-mi* 5:95:37; 4:162:7' (main clauses), but *ša...ikkisū* 4:162:10' (the pret. *nakkis*, also occurs in an oath, after *šumma* 4:162:9', 12'); *hepū*: *ahtapi* 4:177:13, but *ša ihpū* ibid.:15.

⁴⁰⁸On the sibilant in *s/šanāqu*, see above, p. 28. The meaning "to go (to court)" is attested for *sanāqu* already

As an example of this format, 4:172f. is here quoted in full:

<i>ana panē RN</i>	In the presence of RN,
<i>PN u amīlū GN ana dīni išniqū</i>	PN and the men of GN came to court.
<i>PN akanna iqbi mā tam- kārū ša qātīya ina GN dīkū-mi</i>	PN said as follows: "Traders in my charge were murdered in GN."
<i>u šarru dīnšunu akanna īprus mā</i>	The king decided as follows:
<i>PN litmā-mi</i>	"Let PN swear,
<i>u amīlū GN mullā ša tamkārē ana PN limallū-mi</i>	and let the men of GN pay the fine for the traders to PN."
<i>PN u amīlū ina birīšunu imtagrū⁴¹⁰</i>	PN and the men of GN (have) agreed among themselves,
<i>u PN ištu māmītī utterrū</i>	and they (have) allowed PN to refrain from the oath.
<i>amīlū GN 1200 šiqil kaspa ana PN umtelliū</i>	The men of GN (have) paid 1200 shekels of silver to PN.
<i>ina arki ūmi RN aššum tamkārē ana muhhi amīl GN lā iraggum</i>	In future, PN may not contest concerning the fine for the traders against the men of GN,
<i>u amīlū GN aššum 1200 kaspi ana muhhi PN lā [iraggum]ū</i>	and the men of GN may not contest concerning the 1200 silver against PN.
<i>ša iraggum tuppū annū ile'ēšu</i>	This tablet will defeat whoever contests.

in OB *ana dayyānē i nisniq* (cited in AHw, 1021a - *sanāqu* G B 3). Once, in K, instead of *sanāqu*, *ṣabātu* occurs, but still in the pret.: *ana panē PN₁ mār šarri PN₂...PN₃ iṣbat mā...* "In the presence of PN₁, the king's son, PN₂...seized PN₃..., (saying)..." *4:189:1ff.; for *ṣabātu* in this type of context, cf. CAD S, 14f. (*ṣabātu* 2 d).

⁴⁰⁹Or other verbs having to do with presenting evidence:
e.g., *šūlū: PN akanna iqbi mā...[u] PN unūtēšu mimma...ul*

Essentially then, the background of the case (i.e., the coming to court of the litigants, the presentation of the evidence, and the notice that the king made a decision) is presented in clauses in which the verbs are pret. The result, or outcome, of the case consists of a clause or clauses with verb(s) in the perf. Whether these latter should therefore be considered to connote "present relevance," and so require an English present perfect in translation, or whether we are simply dealing with a stylistic device, is probably a moot point; the perf., as will be noted below, is elsewhere in K the norm for simple past action.

As mentioned above, many variations and deletions occur in the various texts. But these are for the most part abbreviations, and the observations made hold good almost without exception. Thus, e.g., in 6:37, *išniqū* is followed by two quotes which are introduced by clauses with *iqbi*; these complete the first part of the text. The next clause has the verb in the perf.: *šarru...[ana] māmīti ittadin* "The king (has) placed...under oath" 22.10ff.; this relates

ušēli "PN said as follows..., but PN did not produce any of the vessels..." 4:170:4ff.

410 This is most likely a Gt pret. (so AHw, 576a); however, a Gt perf. should not be expected, since no forms with double infixed *t* (e.g., *imtatgurū*) occur anywhere in the texts found at Ras Shamra. (They do occur elsewhere in WPA, e.g., in the Amarna letters from Mittanni, but there they are perf.'s of the iterative stems: e.g., *tartata'* 'am - *rāmu* "to love," Gtn - EA 17:11; *ūtetetter* - (w)atāru "to exceed," Dtn - EA 29:40.)

part of the outcome of the case. Text 4:178a contains the heading (*ana panī...*) and the *išniqū* clause; but the text then omits the rest of the preamble, and the next clauses report the outcome of the hearing, again with verbs in the perf.: *PN₁ PN₂ ištu dīni iltēšu u šarru...iltakan sākinnu ...ittadin* "PN₁ (has) defeated PN₂ in the suit, and the king (has) imposed...; the prefect (has) given..." 11.4ff. A number of texts abbreviate even more, giving only the heading, and then jumping immediately to the judgment in, or results of, the case, so that the pret. does not appear at all: e.g., *ana panī RN₁ šar GN₁...PN₁ u PN₂ itti RN₂ šar GN₂ hītata ihtaṭu FN ummašunu...tittadin u...tultellišunuti u...taltakan* "In the presence of RN₁, king of GN₁...: PN₁ and PN₂ (have) committed a crime against RN₂ king of GN₂; and FN their mother (has) given..., and (has) sent them away..., and (has) imposed..." 4:121f.:1ff.

The use of the pret. for the background of legal cases may underly its occurrence in a number of unexpected places, especially in the letters: e.g., *ina hūd libbīšunu akanna aprūls u ana PN akanna aqbī...u PN akanna iqbī* "With their agreement, I decided as follows, and said to PN as follows ...and PN said as follows" 3:7f.:11ff. The context and words here are quasi-legal in nature, and so the pret. is used.⁴¹¹ The outcome of this "case," the next main clause,

⁴¹¹Cf. also 5:94:7ff. It is noteworthy that *qabū* makes up many of the instances of pret. for expected perf. that Aro observes in MB; see idem, *SMBG*, 84ff.

has the verb in the perf.: *u PN napšat(a)ya itt[am]i* "And (so) PN has sworn by my life" 1.22.

Finally, the pret. is also used to express the past tense in the treaties. In fact, the perf. does not appear in those texts at all.

Thus, the use of the pret. in K is to a great extent in agreement with that found in MB. In both, the pret. is preferred in the legal or state texts,⁴¹² while in letters, its use is restricted to certain types of clauses. In the latter, however, there are significant differences between MB and K: in native MB letters, the pret. occurs in interrogative sentences, with negatives, and in all types of subordinate clauses,⁴¹³ while in the K letters, it appears regularly only in relative clauses. In other subordinate clauses with action in the past, two have pret.'s, but two others have perf.'s.⁴¹⁴ With negatives, the verb is pret. only once,⁴¹⁵ but perf. four times.⁴¹⁶ Finally, in the

⁴¹²Except for the clauses expressing the actions resulting from judgments in legal cases, as noted above.

⁴¹³*Arb, SMbG*, 81. The perf. is used in MB in temporal clauses as a future perfect, the verb of the main clause being dur. or prec.; cf. *ibid.*; 148f, 151. No such examples occur in K.

⁴¹⁴With the pret.: 3:7:5f.; 4:54:1f.; with the perf. 5:95:53f.; *5:109:8; these are all quoted above, pp. 138ff.

⁴¹⁵4:170:9; on *lā itūr(a)* in *4:189:19,20, see the last paragraph in this section.

⁴¹⁶4:167:10; 6:36:10; 6:37:9,14.

only question in K, the verb is perf.⁴¹⁷ It would seem, then, that in all of these situations (except for relative clauses), the choice between pret. and perf. was arbitrary, but that the latter was preferred.

In the letters, the normal form for past tense in main clauses is the perf.: e.g., *enūma PN imtahranni mā kirī karānīya ina GN ittaksū-mi* "Now then PN approached me (saying): 'they tore down my vineyard in GN' " 5:95:35ff.; *šar GN pāṭīya ilteqē-mi* [*u ālla ištēn ilteqē-mi* "The king of GN took territories of mine, and one city" *5:90:9f. In these, and in most other examples, the question of "present relevance" is again moot, since the occurrence of the perf. is syntactically determined; that is, the pret. simply does not normally occur in such situations. With *anumma*, however, the immediate past probably *is* implied, the best translation being the present perfect, or even the present: *anumma middata...ultēbilakku* "I hereby send you the measurement..." 4:194:6ff.; note also: *u anumma PN₁ u PN₂ altapra[kku]*⁴¹⁸ "I am hereby sending to you PN₁ and PN₂" 4:188:15ff., for which the duplicate text, 3:6f., has a dur. instead: *anumma PN₁ itti PN₂ illakūnikku* "Now then PN₁ and PN₂ are coming to you" 11.19ff.

To summarize, then, the perf. in K is the normal form for past action in main clauses in letters and the clauses

⁴¹⁷...] *akanna tēteṭ[uš]* "Why/How did you act thus?" *5:90:11. For the lacuna, see above, 85, under *kīkī*.

⁴¹⁸For this restoration, see above, p. 56, n. 128.

in legal texts which express the outcome of a case. It also occurs more often than the pret. in subordinate (except relative) clauses,⁴¹⁹ questions, and negated clauses. The pret. is normal in treaty texts, in the first part of legal texts, and in relative clauses in all text types.

There are of course exceptional instances of both forms in conditions in which they do not usually occur. This is true in MB as well,⁴²⁰ and it can only be suggested that the rules that have been noted were not hard and fast, but rather simply the norm. Thus, a pret. in the latter part of a legal text, after a perf. in a previous clause, cannot really be explained: *inanna PN ittama u mārū GN... ušallimū* "Now, PN swore (has sworn), and the citizens of GN (have) paid..." 4:170:15ff.;⁴²¹ or in a letter, after *anumma: anumma ištu ekalli išpurūnikku* "They hereby send (or: now then, they sent) to you from the palace" 3:6:9f. The perf. occurs once in the "evidence" section of a legal text: *PN ana panī šarri ittaraš* "PN admitted before the king" 4:179:7; for the perf. in a few relative clauses, see above p. 142, n. 404. The exceptions should not, however, obscure the facts, that the pret. and perf. had for

⁴¹⁹In the only protasis of a conditional sentence in which the action is past, the perf. is used (3:8:28f., see above, p. 132).

⁴²⁰Aro, *SMbG*, 83ff.

⁴²¹Cf. also 4:166:4,6, where *itmā-mi* occurs twice, after *šarru...iprus*.

the most part mutually exclusive ranges of use in K, and that the scribes were fairly consistent in this regard.

Only once does the use of a tense appear to be the result of substrate influence, namely, the use of a pret. in a prohibition in *4:189:19,20, quoted above, pp. 57f. Quite probably this use of the pret. reflects WS **yaqtul(a)* (jussive).⁴²²

b. Durative.

The use of the dur. in K generally conforms to that seen elsewhere in Akk.⁴²³ It expresses action that is incomplete, and its tense value in assertions must be derived from its context. The action may take place in the future: e.g., *ina šērti umaššarūka* "In the morning"⁴²⁴ they will release you" 5:109:9f.; also, in the apodosi of most conditional sentences: e.g., *tuppu annū ile''ēšu* "this tablet will defeat him" *AnOr*48:12:23f., etc. With present tense value, note: *anumma PN...ilakakku* "Now then, PN...is coming to you" 4:192:6ff. The dur. may also describe action in the past: e.g., action occurring over a period of time (i.e., which describes circumstantial activity): *dunnāti ša šar GN₁ ša FN...ukallu ina[n]la šar GN₂ ana RN šar GN₁*

⁴²²This phenomenon is much more common in the U texts; see below, p. 346.

⁴²³Cf. GAG §78; Aro, *SMbG*, 80.

⁴²⁴The suggestion of P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 287, "man er-lässt dir die Strafe," seems less felicitous.

uttār "The fortified estates of the king of GN₁ which FN... held, the king of GN₂ has now returned to RN king of GN₁" 4:208:2ff.;⁴²⁵ habitual action, often in the Gtn: e.g., *šar GN harrāni ša tamkārī [il]tanarriq-mi* "The king of GN kept stealing the traders' caravans" 4:176:5f. One verb by its very nature occurs in the dur. for past action: *PN ana tummī lā imangur* "PN would not agree to taking an oath" 4:163:18.⁴²⁶

Because it expresses non-punctual action, it is the natural form to be used in purpose clauses: *u anumma PN₁ altapra[kku] u pāṭī šāšunu-[m]a išakkanūnikku* "And I hereby send to you PN₁ and PN₂ to (re-)establish those very borders for you" 4:188:15ff.

The dur. is also the normal form for prohibitions (negative commands):⁴²⁷ e.g., *mamma lū lā unakkaršunūtī-mi* "No one may alter them" 3:7:17f.; *lā iraggum* "may not contest" 4:167:23,25, and *p.*; *ina pāṭānī[šu lū(?)]* *lā teqerreb* "Do not/You may not approach his borders" *5:91:14f.

In conjunction with the particle *lū*,⁴²⁸ the dur. becomes a (polite?) injunctive in *kī ṭābīš lū tētenepuššū*

⁴²⁵Note also *ša idabbubu* "about which he was speaking" 4:176f.:11,16,22.

⁴²⁶Cf. also 6:37:14 (*lā imagg[ur]*).

⁴²⁷Cf. GAG §81h. For an apparent pret. in a prohibition (*4:189:19,20), see above, pp. 57f.

⁴²⁸Cf. GAG §81e; OB examples are cited in the *Ergänzungsheft* to §81e. For *lū* in general in K, see above, 112f.

"You should treat him well" 4:193:11f., 24f.⁴²⁹

The only use of the dur.--and this is its most frequent use in K--that deviates from native Akk., is its occurrence, without exception, in verbal protases of conditional sentences, where the action conjectured is future. Examples are quoted above, pp. 129ff. In normal MB, the perf. is usually employed.⁴³⁰

In one instance, the dur. appears in a purpose clause after an imper., where normal Akk. would probably have a prec.: *šūšir u šamši minūta eppaš* "prepare...so that my Sun may take a count" 4:192:15f.⁴³¹

c. Imperative and Precative.⁴³²

These show no unusual features in their use. It was noted above (p. 132), that in the apodoses of conditional sentences, the prec. is apparently often interchangeable with the dur. An instance of the dur. for the prec. in a purpose clause was cited above. More normal Akk. usage occurs, e.g., in *PN lutammām-mi akanna liqbi* "Let me adjure PN to say as follows" 3:7f.:14ff.

⁴²⁹In **4:196:7, the dur. is used, without *lū*, with the force of an imper.: *tēma tišappara* "Send me news." This clause is discussed in more detail above, pp. 51f., n. 114.

⁴³⁰Aro, *SMbG*, 144f.

⁴³¹See above, pp. 122f.

⁴³²Cf. *GAG* §81a-d; Aro, *SMbG*, 86f.

d. Stative.⁴³³

The stative too offers few problems of interpretation; its use is for the most part lexically or semantically determined, rather than syntactically. Thus, e.g., the verb *ašābu*, "to dwell," always (five times⁴³⁴) appears in the stative when finite,⁴³⁵ as in *enūma hapīrū ittīya ul ašbū* "Now then, the Hapiru are not dwelling with me" 3:3:6f.

Statives of active-transitive verbs are usually passive: *ašaršunū-mā-mi lū šabtū* "It is in their (present) place that they must be kept" 3:7:15f.; *tuppa kanku ša hepū* "the sealed tablet which was broken" 4:177:18. The only active statives are from the verb *hubbūlu* "to borrow." Normally, the stative of this verb, through an unusual transformation, means "to be indebted, to owe," with a person as subject, and an amount as object.⁴³⁶ This construction occurs in one K text: *300 kaspā habbulātā-mi...mimm[ā] lla habbulākū-mi* "You owe 300 silver...I owe nothing" *4:189:5ff. The *expected* passive transformation of this verb should have resulted in the thing borrowed becoming the

⁴³³On the treatment of the stative in this study, see above, 12ff. See also the more detailed discussion of the stative forms in U, below, pp. 355ff.

⁴³⁴3:3f., 7:11; 4:163:22', 26'; 6:37:10; cf. also **4:197:17.

⁴³⁵The infinitive occurs in 4:193:8; the Š, of course, occurs as a fientic verb (e.g., *ultēšibši* AnOr48:12:12).

⁴³⁶Cf. CAD H, 6f.; AHw, 302; M.B. Rowton, "The Use of the Permissive in Classic Babylonian," JNES 21 (1962), 268 (no. 242).

the subject, but this is not the case in any of the examples in the dictionaries. It does occur, however, in another K text: 800 *kaspa ša PN ša ana muhḫṭya hubbuḷ ana PN ulṭal-lim-mi* "I paid the 800 silver of PN that was owed by (lit.: charged against) me" 5:94:18ff. It may also occur earlier in the same text: 400 *KÙ.BABBAR ana muhḫi PN₁ u ana muhḫi PN₂ [a]n[ā]k[u](??)⁴³⁷ hubbuḷ-mi* *ibid.*:8ff. Unfortunately, the case of *KÙ.BABBAR* is not marked. Nougayrol translates: "J'avais une créance de 400 (sicles d')argent sur [PN₁] et (une autre) à la charge de [PN₂]" This is possible only if the scribe was ignorant of the morphology of the stative, for *hubbuḷāku* is expected; cf. *4:189:8, cited above. Perhaps this was in fact the case, since, interestingly, the forms in *4:189:6,8 are the only statives in K that are not third person. Yet none of the other forms is incorrect, and the occurrence of the 2ms and 1s in *4:189 suggests that the scribes did understand the formation of the stative. Thus (to get back to the original point), it is possible that the sentence in 5:94:8ff. should be rendered like the one in *ll.*18ff.: "400 silver (*kaspu*, nom.) was owed to me(??) by (lit.: against) PN₁ and PN₂." If *anāku* is in fact the word in the break, this proposal would also indicate scribal ignorance--but in this case, of the construction of the expression itself, for an independent nom. pronoun is certainly out of place as an indirect object.

⁴³⁷The copy has ~~anāku~~.

The stative has no specific tense value (or, connotes no specific aspect). The examples cited above show that it could represent past and present action; the lack of an example with future sense is fortuitous. To express a will toward a state, i.e., the jussive of the stative, the particle *lū* is used.⁴³⁸ For examples, see above, p. 112.

11. *The Construction of the Infinitive*

Infinitives occur only rarely in K. Two of the examples are very similar: *PN ana tummî ul imangur* 4:167:18; *PN [ana tlummîšu lā imaggur]* 6:37:14. Both mean, freely, "PN would not agree to take an oath." However, it is the G of *tamû* that means "to swear, take an oath"; the D is causative, "to adjure, cause to swear."⁴³⁹ Thus, the D infinitives here are passive in voice, a rather uncommon phenomenon, but not an unknown one;⁴⁴⁰ a literal translation would be: "PN would not agree to (his) being adjured." *magāru* is often construed with *ana* plus an infinitive.⁴⁴¹

An infinitive in a genitive absolute construction (i.e., without a preposition) occurs in *enūma PN₁ ašrānu itti PN₂ ašābi illaka* "Now then, PN₁ is coming there to live with

⁴³⁸Cf. GAG §81b.

⁴³⁹AHw, 1317f.

⁴⁴⁰Cf. GAG §85b; J. Aro, *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen*, *Studia Orientalia* 26 (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1961), 297f.

⁴⁴¹Cf. AHw, 575b (*magāru* G II 2 b); Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 121.

PN₂" 4:193:6ff. *itti* here governs only the following PN, not the infinitive; the expected construction is *itti PN ana ašābi*.⁴⁴² However, genitive infinitives without prepositions occur elsewhere, and Aro notes that they usually connote purpose ("finalen Sinn"),⁴⁴³ as the present example obviously does.

One other infinitive may occur, in 4:176:3f.: PN 4000 *kaspa ana ha-ma-ši ilteqē-mi* "PN has taken 4000 silver ...". Nougayrol translates *ha-ma-ši* "frauduleusement(?)", but offers no support for this, and no verb *hamāšu* fits this rendering.⁴⁴⁴ Perhaps it should be emended to *ha-la!-lī*,⁴⁴⁵ the genitive of *halālu*, "to creep, slink, steal."⁴⁴⁶ The phrase *ana halāli* would then mean "in stealth." Von Soden makes an equally plausible suggestion, to read *ana ha-ba!-lī* "by force."⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴²*ana* plus infinitive is a very common means of expressing purpose in Akk.; cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 119ff. (with *alāku*, p. 119); see also idem, *SMbG*, 127ff. (*alāku*, 131.)

⁴⁴³Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 69ff. All of Aro's examples of this construction are OB or SB. However, note the following from Boghazkoy: *šumma mithuši tallaka* "if you are coming to fight" KBo 1:3:38f., alongside *ana mithuši ana pantya ittalkū* "they have come before me to fight" KBo 1:2:23 (both cited in CAD A/1, 307a).

⁴⁴⁴Cf. CAD H, 60f.; AHW, 315f.

⁴⁴⁵*LIM* elsewhere in K occurs word-finally only as a phonetic complement to logograms; see above, p. 27, n. 38.

⁴⁴⁶CAD H, 33b (*halālu* A).

⁴⁴⁷AHW, 301b (*habālu* I 1). In either case, the preposition *ana* is peculiar; *ina* is expected; cf. *ina emū[qi]* "by force" 6:36:5.

12. *The Syntax of the Accusative Case*

a. General.

There is no occurrence in K of a verb with a double acc.⁴⁴⁸ While this may be purely coincidental, it is nevertheless quite remarkable.

The acc. is occasionally used adverbially, i.e., to replace a prepositional phrase.⁴⁴⁹ An acc. of place ("where") is: *ašaršunū-mā-mi lū šabtū* "it is in their (present) place that they must be maintained" 3:7:15f.; cf. 4:188:11f. (for *ina ašrīšunū-mā-mi*). The frequent adverbial expression *urram šēram*⁴⁵⁰ "in future" consists of two nouns in acc. of time ("when"). Both *gabbu* and *mimma* occur as acc.'s of respect, meaning "entirely" and "(not) at all" respectively. For examples, see above, pp. 38, 41f. In two instances, prepositions are deleted after *ša*,⁴⁵¹ in effect leaving the following nouns as acc.'s of place: *ša libbi GN ašbū* "who live in GN" 4:163:26' (cf. 1.22', with *ina GN*); *kaspu [ša] muhḥīšu*⁴⁵² "silver owed by him" 5:94:10f. Finally, the acc. even replaces a prepositional phrase with *aššum*: compare *kaspa ša 400 imērī ša idabbubu PN litma*

⁴⁴⁸On the D and Š conjugations in particular, see above, pp. 64ff., and especially nn. 157, 162.

⁴⁴⁹Cf. GAG §§146, 147.

⁴⁵⁰Cf. PRU 3, 230, s.v.

⁴⁵¹Cf. GAG §115c.

⁴⁵²On this reading, see above, p. 81, n. 202

"let PN swear concerning the silver of the 400 asses, about which he was speaking" 4:177:22f., and *u mārū GN aššum NĪ. GU₄.MEŠ-šu-nu aššum unūtēšunu itammūni* "The citizens of GN will swear concerning their possessions(?) and their vessels" 4:155:14ff.⁴⁵³

b. The Resumptive Accusative Suffix.

In a few instances, the direct object of a sentence is resumed by an acc. pronominal suffix on the verb.⁴⁵⁴ This feature is not found in any relative clauses,⁴⁵⁵ but rather only in main clauses. The object to which the suffix refers invariably precedes its verb, and is always a person or persons.⁴⁵⁶ Sometimes, it is probable that a resumptive pronoun is employed because the object is greatly separated from the verb: e.g., *u šarru PN aššum X kaspi u unūte siparri...* (etc., for six lines)...*ana māmīti ittadinšu* "And the king placed PN under oath concerning the X silver,

⁴⁵³Usually, the acc. with *taṃū* indicates what the oath is sworn by: e.g., *PN napšata ša šarri litmā-mi* "Let PN swear by the king's life" 3:8:20f. (cf. l.22); cf. *AHw*, 1317b (*taṃū* G I). For "to swear an oath" in K, note: *ina māmīti itammūni* 4:156f.:22,40. Note that our interpretation of 4:177:22f. above differs from Nougayrol's; see above, p. 133, and n. 373.

⁴⁵⁴4:151:10; 4:167:17; 4:178:5; *AnOr*48:11f.:8,11; probably also 3:8:26 (see n. 456, below); possibly *5:109:16. Cf. also the last paragraph in this section, and note **4:196:9.

⁴⁵⁵Cf. e.g., *amīlī...ša iddinū* "men whom they sell..." 4:163:30'.

⁴⁵⁶A probable example with a pl. is *amīlī annūti ana ṭemmi attāšūnu(?)* "I brought these men to agreement" 3:8:25f.

the vessels of copper, etc." 4:167:10ff. But the suffix occurs in short sentences as well: *PN₁ PN₂ ištu dīni iltēšu* "PN₁ defeated PN₂ in court" 4:178:4f. It is doubtful that any particular emphasis is placed on the object because of the suffix, since the word order of the sentence is never altered.⁴⁵⁷ It should be repeated that this feature is not common in K; normally, there is no resumptive suffix.⁴⁵⁸

It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether the following common sentence should be included here, or whether the direct object, a relative clause that stands at the head of the sentence, should be considered a *casus pendens*: *ša iraggum tuppū annū ile''ēšu*⁴⁵⁹ "This tablet will defeat whoever contests" 4:179:16f.; 6:36:r4', and often.

13. Incomplete and Interrupted Grammar

a. Ellipsis.

Ellipsis occurs a few times in the letters. Once, an object is omitted:⁴⁶⁰ *libbašu ša šamši mimma lū lā imalla*

⁴⁵⁷I.e., these are not to be considered examples of *casus pendens* (cf. *GAG* §128); note that wherever the case can be determined in these examples, it is acc. For true *casus pendens*, see below, pp. 162f.

⁴⁵⁸E.g., *u PN ištu māmtti utterrū* "They allowed PN to refrain from (taking) an oath" 4:172:10f.; *šar GN₁ [RN šar] GN₂ [...] umteššer* "The king of GN₁ has released RN the king of GN₂..." 4:150:3ff.; etc.

⁴⁵⁹This of course represents **tuppū annū ša iraggum ile''e*.

⁴⁶⁰Cf. *GAG* §184d.

"Let not the Sun's heart be full (of wrath)"⁴⁶¹ 4:192:17ff.⁴⁶²

In another instance, the apodosis of a conditional sentence is left unsaid: *šumma attā uḷ tīdēšū ahūšu ša PN šūt* "In case (if) you do not know him (, I will tell you:) he is PN's brother" 4:193:17ff. Finally, as noted by von Soden,⁴⁶³ phrases beginning with *aššum*, at the head of the main body of many letters, are also unfinished sentences (cf. our *in re*): e.g., *aššum pāṭīka ša tašpura* "(I am writing/This is a reply) concerning your borders, about which you wrote me" 4:188:6f. Oaths, since they are incomplete conditional sentences, are also a form of ellipsis; see the next section.

b. Oaths.

The oath in K is always an uncompleted conditional sentence, i.e., a protasis without an apodosis (and so, a form of ellipsis). Literally, then, the form is: "if I do X (, I am cursed)."⁴⁶⁴ All examples but one are denials

⁴⁶¹Cf. *AHw*, 597b (*maḷū* G 8); the idiom recurs in a letter that is probably from Khatti, *PRU* 4:222:13,30f., and (in the D) 26f. Nougayrol cites a Hittite parallel, *PRU* 4, 192, n. 2.

⁴⁶²It is likely that ellipsis, also omission of the object, occurs when *tamū* is used intransitively (even though this happens throughout Akk.; cf. *AHw*, 1317b - *tamū* G II). The verb seems originally to have meant "to mention, invoke (a DN) solemnly"; the DN, or *nēš ilī*, or the like, is usually omitted, and the verb comes to mean simply "to swear" e.g., *ina GN ina māmīti itammūni* "They will swear by an oath" 4:156:21f. By this period, the oaths themselves only rarely--and never in K--involve the mention of a DN; see below, for examples.

⁴⁶³*GAG* §184c.

⁴⁶⁴Cf. *GAG* §185g-1.

of (involvement in) past events, and thus are non-negated clauses. All tenses occur; note e.g., the following examples from 4:161ff.: pret.: *šumma karānīšunu nēnu nakkis-mi* "We did not tear down their vineyards" 1.9'; perf.: *šumma ana mamma amīli šanīm-ma ana šīmi nattadin-mi ū nattak(k)ir-mi*⁴⁶⁵ "We have not sold or taken away (servants of RN) to anyone else" 1.25'; dur. Gtn: *šumma šīkara nēnu...nattanadin-mi* "We have not been giving beer..." 1.17'f.; preformative stative: *u šumma amīlī...nīdē-mi* "Nor do we know the men..." 1.10'. One promissory oath occurs, also negative: *šumma ina arki ūmi PN₁ PN₂ mārūšunu...aššum zittīšunu ana muhhi RN...iraggumū* "In future, PN₁ and PN₂, their children...will not contest against RN...concerning their inheritance" 4:122:14ff.⁴⁶⁶

In one instance, the verb of an oath is apparently subjunctive, as is the case in Ass.: *šumma...nīddūku* "We did not kill..." 5:95:45ff.; see above, p. 61.

c. Parenthesis.

There is one instance of a parenthetical insertion into a sentence:⁴⁶⁷ *inanna šar GN ? napšāti ina libbīšunu 3 amīlū 4 sinnīšātu kīmū bīt PN₁...ana PN₂ ittadin* "Now,

⁴⁶⁵On the form and meaning of this word, see above, 65.

⁴⁶⁶Compare with this the ubiquitous prohibition *ina arki ūmi PN₁ aššum X ana muhhi PN₂ lā iraggum*, e.g., 4:173:12ff.

⁴⁶⁷Cf. GAG §182.

the king of GN has given 7 'souls' (among them 3 men and 4 women) to PN₂ in exchange for the estate of PN₁..." 4:168:8ff.

d. Casus Pendens.

There is only one certain example of a casus pendens,⁴⁶⁸ and it seems to have arisen not for emphasis, but to avoid an even more awkward grammatical construction: *mannum-mê ša rikilta annīta ušašnâ DN₁...DN₆ lû bēlû māmītīšû* "As for anyone who alters this treaty, may DN₁...DN₆ be the lords of his oath" 4:156:49ff. There are other sentences whose first constituent may be a casus pendens: e.g., the frequent *ša iraggum tuppu annû ile''ēšû* may mean "As for whoever contests, this tablet will defeat him," but the sentence could simply have word order O-S-V, with a resumptive pronoun on the verb.⁴⁶⁹ In *PN ištû X kaspi qātšû ēteli*, 4:166:5 (cf. 6f.), *PN* may be topicalized: "As for *PN*, he forfeited *X* silver (i.e., his hand went up from...); however, it is also possible that the scribe misunderstood the idiom,⁴⁷⁰ and intended *qātšû* as an adverbial acc. ("PN went up with respect to his hand..."). Finally, a nominal sentence such as *X kaspu...annû šû*, 4:176:11f., may be nor-

⁴⁶⁸Von Soden refers to "zusammengesetzte Nominalsätze"; cf. *GAG* §128.

⁴⁶⁹See above, pp. 158f.

⁴⁷⁰See above, pp. 45f.

mal grammar for K, reflecting WS influence, with šū almost as a copula:⁴⁷¹ "The X silver...is this"; or, the beginning of the sentence may be a casus pendens: "As for the X silver..., it is this."

e. Anacoluthon.

Anacoluthon,⁴⁷² or the change to new grammar in the middle of a sentence, is rare in K. The only examples I can find are: *u RN₁ ištu GN₁ ša ištu [kakkīš]u(?) ileqqū u [ša] ina mātīšu...irrubū šumma ina arki ūmi RN₂ ardīšu errišu u RN₁ mimma lū lā utarraššunūti* "And RN₁, out of GN₁, those whom he takes by his weapons(?), or who enter his land...--if in future RN₂ demands his servants (back), RN₁ is in no way obligated to return them" 4:54f.:9ff.; *RN₁ šar GN₁ dunnāti ša šar GN₂ ša FN...ukallu inanna šar GN₁ ana RN₂ šar GN₂ uttēr* "RN₁ king of GN₁ the fortified estates of the king of GN₂, which FN...holds--now then, the king of GN₁ has returned (them) to RN₂ king of GN₂" 4:208:1ff. In one instance, *šumma* is repeated to clarify an awkward sentence: *šumma tuppā kanku ša hepū šumma ša X kaspi šū...* "if the sealed tablet which was broken--if it is the one of X silver..." 4:177:17f.

⁴⁷¹See above, pp. 96f., and n. 249.

⁴⁷²Cf. GAG §183.

PART II

THE AKKADIAN DIALECT OF UGARIT

A. THE CORPUS

The corpus on which the following study of the Akk. dialect of Ugarit is based consists of 23 letters, 201 legal texts, and 29 economic texts. They are listed below, by excavation number (and place of publication) for texts found at Ras Shamra, by the number in Knudtzon's *EA* for texts found at el-Amarna.

a. Letters (L):

*15.11 (3:19)	*20.182A(+)B (5:111f., no 36)
*15.14 (3:5)	20.184 (5:97f., no. 28)
16.112 (3:4)	20.200C (5:100, no. 29)
*17.239 (6:11f., no. 8)	20.238 (5:87f., no. 24)
17.455 (6:5b, no. 3)	*20.239 (5:141f., no. 52)
19.70 (4:294)	*1957.2 (<i>AnOr</i> 48:23f.)
*19.80 (6:2f., no. 2)	<i>EA</i> 45
*20.13 (5:137, no. 49)	** <i>EA</i> 46
*20.23 (5:145f., no. 54)	** <i>EA</i> 47
*20.158 (5:139f., no. 51)	** <i>EA</i> 48
20.168 (5:80ff., no. 21)	<i>EA</i> 49.
20.178 (5:147f., no. 55)	

Only ten letters may be said with certainty to have been written at Ugarit. In eight cases, the sender is a king of Ugarit: 3:4; 4:294;¹ 5:80ff.; 5:87f.; 5:97f.; 5:100; *EA*45; *EA*49. The sender of 5:147f. is one Rap'anu, in whose house in Ugarit the letter was found. 6:5b was sent to a king of Ugarit by his prefect (*sākinnu*).

¹This was sent by a king and queen together.

The probability that the rest of the above letters found at Ras Shamra were written there is in each case quite high: *3:5 and *5:111f. are almost certainly from a king of Ugarit, and *6:2f. from a Ugaritic queen; *3:19, *5:139f., and *5:141f. were written to the prefect² by superiors or peers who were probably officials in the court at Ugarit or in its provinces; *5:145f.³ is a double letter to Rap'anu (see above), thus, a copy of two letters--one from the prefect (*sākin*), and one from a servant of Rap'anu; *5:137 is also a double letter, to an individual who is elsewhere listed as a courtier of the queen⁴-- a copy of a letter from "the queen," and a copy of a letter from a superior or peer; *6:11f. is from the prefect (*sākinnu*) to an inferior official; AnOr48:23f. is to the king from a servant of his, and a GN mentioned in the text is known to have been in the state of Ugarit.⁵

²*rābiṣu* (L^UMAŠKIM) in *3:19; *sākinu* in *5:141f. In *5:139f., the sender is one Uzzinu, who in another text (PRU 4:237:6f., probably from Khatti) is called *šākin* (L^UŠA. KIN) *Ugarit*.

³This letter was written by a very inexperienced scribe; note the following aberrations: no case-ending on L^U*sa-ki-in* (l.1); *šul-ma* (nom.) (l.3); *it* for *itti* (ll.7, 24, 25, 26); *šul-ma-na* (l.8; elsewhere *šulmānu/i*; cf. l.22); *ṣ(-)KUR(-)* *er-an-nu* for *ṣma terranni* (l.8; cf. l.27; see below, 258, n.358). *a-mi-nu* for *am-mīni* (l.11); *tu-ū-ha-ri* for *tuhhar* (l.11); *ū-ri-di-ia* for *arādiya* (l.13); two scribal omissions: *pa-<ni>-ka* (l.14); *um<-ma>* l.20. Because of the abnormality of its forms, this text is only sporadically referred to in the following sections.

⁴Yankhamu, called a *mūdū šarrati* in 3:162b:6; cf. 5, 136, n. 4.

⁵Cf. Astour's commentary in AnOr48, 25f.

There is less certainty in the case of the other three letters found at el-Amarna. The type of clay is apparently the same; and the script is the same.⁶ What can be discerned about the grammar show no peculiarities vis-à-vis other U texts. However, their Ugarit origin must remain less probable than the other texts. Thus, they will be used with much caution below, serving only as secondary, or additional, information; they will be marked with a double asterisk (**).

Three other letters were probably sent by Ugaritic officials: PRU 4:221ff. (17.383); PRU 4:223ff. (17.422); Ug. 5:129f. (no. 44; 20.219). However, the officials were stationed outside the state of Ugarit, and it is likely that the letters were written by scribes where they were stationed: Khatti in the case of the first two; Siyannu in the third.

Several other texts are noted by Kühne⁷ as possibly originating in Ugarit. In one case (5:104, no. 32; 20.243), the probability is quite high. But the text is so badly broken--never more than six signs visible, at the ends of the lines--that there is little point in including it in the study; it provides no new information. With the rest

⁶Cf. W.F. Albright, "An Unrecognized Amarna Letter from Ugarit," *BASOR* 95 (1944), 30; M. Liverani, *Storia di Ugarit* (Rome: Università di Roma, Studi Semitici 6, 1962), 23.

⁷UF 7, 129ff.

of the texts,⁸ there is simply not enough evidence to determine their place of origin, and so they too have been excluded from our corpus.

b. *Legal or Juridical Texts (J)*:

8.145 (<i>Sy</i> 18:249f.)	15.167+163 (3:124)
8.207 (3:34b)	15.168 (3:136f.)
8.208 (3:110f.; <i>Sy</i> 18:253f.)	15.173 (3:40b)
8.213 (<i>Sy</i> 18:251f.)	15.180 (3:36c)
3.279 (3:170b)	15.182 (3:35f.)
11.856 (<i>RA</i> 38:5)	15.190 (3:137b)
14.16 (<i>Sy</i> 28:173f.)	15.Y (3:78)
15.37 (3:35a)	15.Z (3:58f.)
15.41 (3:38b)	16.61 (3:39a)
15.81 (3:37a)	16.86 (3:137f.)
15.85 (3:52f.)	16.114 (3:33f.)
15.89 (3:53b)	16.129 (3:32f.)
15.90 (3:54a)	16.131 (3:138f.)
15.91 (3:75b)	16.132 (3:140f.)
15.92 (3:54ff.)	16.133 (3:59f.)
15.109+16.296 (3:102ff.)	16.134 (3:141f.)
15.114 (3:112f.)	16.135 (3:89f.)
15.118 (3:131a)	16.136 (3:142b)
15.119 (3:86ff.)	16.137 (3:143a)
15.120 (3:56f.)	16.138 (3:143ff.)
15.122 (3:131f.)	16.139 (3:145f.)
15.123+16.152 (3:89a)	16.140 (3:45f.)
15.126 (3:112a)	16.141 (3:60b)
15.127(+)15.131 (3:132, 3:133)	16.142 (3:77b)
15.132 (3:133f.)	16.143 (3:81ff.)
15.136 (3:121f.)	16.144 (3:76a)
15.137 (3:134f.)	16.145 (3:169)
15.138+16.393B (3:101f.)	16.147 (3:90b)
15.139 (3:166f.)	16.148+254B (3:115f.)
15.140 (3:136f.)	16.150 (3:47a)
15.141 (3:136b)	16.153 (3:146f.)
15.143+164 (3:117)	16.154 (3:127f.)
15.145 (3:122f.)	16.156 (3:61f.)
15.146+161 (3:58a)	16.157 (3:83b.)
15.147 (3:125)	16.158 (3:62b)
15.150 (3:171a)	16.160 (3:76b)
15.155 (3:118)	16.162 (3:126)
	16.163 (3:169f.)

⁸E.g., 15.63 (3:20); 20.15 (5:143f., no. 53); 20.19 (5:135, no. 48); 20.141B (5:108, no. 34); 20.232 (5:154f., no. 58).

16.166 (3:47f.)	16.276 (3:69f.)
16.170 (3:91a)	16.277 (3:50f.)
16.171 (3:147b)	16.279 (3:70b)
16.163 (3:161b)	16.281 (3:161b)
16.174 (3:63b)	16.282 (3:160f.)
16.178 (3:148a)	16.283 (3:74b)
16.182+199 (3:148f.)	16.284 (3:99)
16.184 (3:149f.)	16.285 (3:106f.)
16.186 (3:168a)	16.286 (3:161f.)
16.188 (3:150b)	16.287 (3:37b)
16.189 (3:91f.)	16.295 (3:70f.)
16.190 (3:64a)	16.343 (3:129a)
16.191A (3:172b)	16.344 (3:75a)
16.197 (3:150f.)	16.348 (3:162f.)
16.200 (3:64f.)	16.353 (3:113ff.)
16.201 (3:151f.)	16.356 (3:71f.)
16.202 (3:152f.)	16.363 (3:163f.)
16.204 (3:119f.)	16.368 (3:100a)
16.205+192 (3:153f.)	16.371 (3:72f.)
16.206 (3:109b)	16.384 (3:165a)
16.208 (3:93a)	16.385 (3:73f.)
16.238 (3:107f.)	16.386 (3:165f.)
16.239 (3:79ff.)	17.01 (6:28f., no. 27)
16.240 (3:173a)	17.20 (5:7, no. 4)
16.242 (3:154f.)	17.21 (5:3f., no. 2)
16.243 (3:155f.)	17.22+87 (5:8f., no. 5)
16.245 (3:94f.)	17.33 (5:5f., no. 3)
16.246 (3:95f.)	17.36 (5:10f., no. 7)
16.247 (3:65b)	17.38 (5:12, no. 8)
16.248 (3:48f.)	17.39 (6:30, no. 28.)
16.249 (3:96ff.)	17.53 (6:27b, no. 25)
16.250 (3:85f.)	17.61 (5:13, no. 9)
16.251 (3:108f.)	17.65 (5:2f., no. 1)
16.252 (3:66a)	17.67 (5:14f., no. 10)
16.253 (3:156f.)	17.77 (6:42f., no. 43)
16.254A (3:66b)	17.84 (6:63f., no. 68)
16.254C+255C (3:157b)	17.86+241+208 (5:262f., no. 159)
16.254D (3:79a)	17.88 (6:38, no. 37)
16.254E (3:173b)	17.102 (5:263b, no. 160)
16.254F (3:158a)	17.147 (6:31, no. 29)
16.255A+E (3:67a)	17.149 (5:9f., no. 6)
16.255B (3:173c)	17.322 (6:47, no. 47)
16.255D (3:158b)	17.325 (5:264, no. 161)
16.256 (3:159a)	17.329 (6:64b, no. 69)
16.260 (3:98f.)	17.331 (6:24, no. 21)
16.261+339+241 (3:159f.)	17.350B (6:46, no. 46)
16.262 (3:67b)	17.356 (6:39f., no. 38)
16.263 (3:49b)	17.358 (6:40f., no. 39)
16.267 (3:110a)	17.360a (6:41, no. 40)
16.269 (3:68f.)	17.363 (6:25a, no. 22)
16.275 (3:50a)	

17.376+377 (6:25f., no. 23)	19.78 (6:52f., no. 52)
17.378A (6:48f., no. 49)	19.98 (6:32f., no. 31)
17.388 (6:50, no. 50)	19.128 (6:34b, no. 32)
17.408 (6:34f., no. 33)	20.146 (5:176f., no. 83)
17.410 (6:35b, no. 34)	20.176 (5:181, no. 86)
17.426 (6:51f., no. 51)	20.203B (5:182f., no. 87)
18.21 (6:44f., no. 45)	20.226 (5:176a, no. 82)
18.22 (6:55f., no. 55)	20.236 (5:179f., no. 85)
18.53 (6:27a, no. 24)	20.252A (5:185, no. 90)
18.264 (6:62b, no. 65)	21.07A (5:183f., no. 88)
18.274 (6:62f., no. 66)	21.230 (5:173f., no. 81)
18.280 (6:42b, no. 42)	27.053 (6:53, no. 53).
18.500 (6:32a, no. 30)	

The U legal texts form the largest single group of Akk. documents discovered at Ugarit. There are enough of them that it is possible to include only those that can be determined with certainty to have been composed there. Thus, a number of texts, such as *PRU* 3:41a (16.180), which do not bear the name or seal of a Ugaritic king, and whose content suggests the possibility that they were issued elsewhere, have been omitted from consideration. Several others listed by Kühne⁹ as U texts have also been excluded from consideration, because they are mere fragments that contain no evidence for the grammar.

Text 6:50 (no. 50; 17.388) was written by an inexperienced scribe, and contains a number of forms (especially verbs) that do not conform to those in the rest of the texts: *e-na-da-ni* (for *inaddin* or *ittadin*; 1.7); *e-te-e-ru* (for *itūrū* or *iturrū*; 1.15); *te-ša-bi-tu*₄¹⁰ (for *išabbatū*;

⁹UF 7, 129ff.

¹⁰This form is discussed below, pp. 230f.

l.16); *ú-ma-la-e* (for *umallû*; ll.17,19); A.SI.MI (for *šum-ma?*; l.14). As Nougayrol notes,¹¹ since the scribe wrote the PN's properly, it is in fact the grammar that he was unfamiliar with. This text, like *5:145f.(L), will, with few exceptions, be referred to only in the notes, since its forms are not normative for the U dialect.

Because of the number of U legal texts that mention or bear seals incised with the name of the king under whom they were issued, it is possible, as mentioned in the Introduction, to study them chronologically. Because of their rigorously formulaic nature, they did not undergo a great many changes over the century and a half during which they were written. Nevertheless, a few innovations or shifts occurred, and these have been noted where appropriate.

c. *Economic Texts* (Ec.)

Only the following economic dockets are cited in the sections below:

11.732 (3:181f.)	19.08 (6:112b, no. 145)
11.839 (3:194f.)	19.19A (6:104f., no. 134)
12.34+43 (3:192f.)	19.20 (6:119a, no. 156)
15.76 (<i>PRU</i> 2:116, republished without no. in 6:99)	19.23 (6:119b, no. 157)
15.135 (3:206f.)	19.24 (6:120a, no. 158)
16.257... (3:199ff.)	19.32 (6:74b, no. 77)
17.50 (6:68f., no. 70)	19.36 (6:108b, no. 138)
17.64 (6:96b, no. 116)	19.41 (6:75f., no. 78)
17.136 (6:96f., no. 117)	19.43 (6:91f., no. 94)
17.361C (6:74a, no. 76)	19.57 (6:101a, no. 127)
17.476 (5:20b, no. 13)	19.71 (6:95c, no. 114)
	19.99 (6:123f., no. 166)
	19.104 (6:101b, no. 128)

¹¹*PRU* 6, 50, n. 1.

19.127 (6:112f., no. 147) 20.12 (5:189f., no. 96)
19.130 (6:90a, no. 101) 20.211A/B... (5:195ff., no.
19.141 (6:98c, no. 121) 105).

There are in fact over 150 economic texts that were written at Ugarit. Most of them are mere lists of names of persons or occupations, town, quantities of objects, and the like, many of them written almost entirely in logograms.¹² These can add very little to our evidence for the phonology and morphology of the dialect; since they contain no clauses, they add nothing at all to our knowledge of the syntax. Thus, the bulk of these texts are not cited in this study. However, there are a few texts that do provide us with some information, especially for the morphology. It is these that are referred to sporadically below, and that have therefore been listed above.

d. Since the mythological and literary texts, and the syllabaries, vocabularies, and lists of weights and measures, were undoubtedly copied from, or at least based upon, Mesopotamian originals, they have been excluded from the corpus of texts upon which this study is based.

¹²E.g., PRU 3:205b (16.155); Ug. 5:17ff. (no. 12; 17.150+34); Ug. 5:187f. (no. 95; 20.01); Ug. 5:189f. (no. 96; 20.12); etc.

B. NOTES ON ORTHOGRAPHY AND PHONOLOGY

a. Logograms are infrequent in the letters and legal texts, but naturally occur more often in economic dockets. For the most part, they are employed correctly. However, there are a few mistakes. In 3:102ff.:52 (and probably in 1.18 as well), we have ŠU.BA.AN.TE for *ilqe* instead of ŠU.BA.AN.TI (see below, paragraph g).

The expression *ina ūmi balāṭiṣu* "for all the days of his life," is written several different ways, incorporating logograms; see below, p. 305, n. 502.

In 6:48:7', the logogram for *sittaṣu* "his share," which is in the nom., is correctly written HA.LA-*šu*. But in 1.15', *a-na* HA.LI is written; apparently the scribe considered the logogram to be a declinable noun.¹³ In *5:145f., a badly written text (see p. 165, n. 3), HAL.LA.MEŠ occurs, probably for the related adjective *sīs(ūt)u* "divided up."¹⁴

b. The determinatives MEŠ and HI.A are of course found throughout the corpus as means of marking the plural: e.g., DINGIR.MEŠ...KÚR-*ru-ki* "may the gods...protect you" 5:148:8ff. A.ŠĀ.HI.A *an-nu-ti*¹⁵ "these fields" 3:123:19. Not

¹³Cf. *ki-e* UR.KI "like a dog" EA138:96 (from Byblos), instead of normal UR.KU=*kalbu*. This was pointed out by W. L. Moran, "Byblos," 177.

¹⁴Cf. the similar use of TIL(.LA) for *balātu* instead of normal TI(.LA), p. in Amarna letters from Syria-Palestine; see EA II, 1388, for examples.

¹⁵On the gender, see below, pp. 314f.

infrequently, however, they do not indicate plurality. Sometimes, e.g., MEŠ is used to indicate the abstract ending -ūt, undoubtedly because it is homophonous with the adjectival m. pl. ending; the clearest examples of this are: *a-na É.GI.A.MEŠ(-šu)* for *ana kallūtī(šu)* "in marriage (lit.: for daughter-in-law-ship)" 3:60b:9,13; (*a-na*) DUMU.MEŠ(-šu) for (*ana*) *marūt(īšu)* "in adoptive sonship" 3:55:6(bis). Other probable instances are: LÚ.MEŠ¹⁶DAM.GÂR-(*ut-*)*ti* for *tamkārūt(t)ī* "status of trader" 6:32:10,13; LÚ.MEŠ¹⁷*mar-ia-nu-ti* "status of *maryannu*" 6:33:23 (cf. *i-na* LÚ.MEŠ¹⁸*mar-ia-an-ni* "among the m.'s" 3:140:6); LÚŠÀ.TAM.MEŠ for *šatam-mūti* (gen.) "office of steward" 3:132:30; cf. 6:29:30.

In most cases, however, when the determinatives do not denote plurality, they seem to serve no other purpose than to mark the sign(s) they follow as logograms.¹⁸ They occur, e.g., on logograms for sg. verbs: BA.UG₇.MEŠ *mi-ta-ku* "(if) I die" 3:76a:5; SUM.MEŠ for *iddin* "he gave" 3:103:19 (vs. ŠU.BA.AN.Ā.TI.E for *ilqe* "he took" in l.18); on nouns modified by sg. adjectives: e.g., A.ŠÀ.HI.A *an-nu-ū/* *an-na-a/an-ni-i* 3:121f.:9,14,19, and often; LÚ.MEŠ *ša-nu-ū* "another man" 3:114:26; on an adjective modifying a sg. noun: *hī-i-ṭ-ṭā* GĀL.MEŠ "a great crime" 3:97:15.¹⁹ The

¹⁶AHw, 1315b.

¹⁷AHw, 1199b.

¹⁸Cf. Nougayrol's comment in *Ug.* 5, 146, n. 2.

¹⁹Note also *a-na-ku...ū* ĪR.MEŠ-ma "I am indeed a servant..." **EA47:10f.

logogram for *kaspu* "silver" is most often simply KÙ.BABBAR, e.g., 3:60b:14,16; 3:33a:7. However, it is not uncommon for it to be followed by MEŠ:²⁰ e.g., 3:106:12; 3:112:10; in 3:93b:4,5,6, it occurs with and without MEŠ. Occasionally, HI.A follows: e.g., 3:89b:6. It is most likely that in all cases, the sg. *kaspu* is intended. It is also likely that these determinatives do not mark the pl. in other instances, but for contextual rather than grammatical reasons: e.g., 10 *kaspa ina MU.MEŠ(šatti) uppal* "He will pay 10 silver per year" 3:84:21 (cf. *ina MU-te-šu* 3:135a:14); *tapaṭṭar ana SILA.MEŠ (sūqi)* "She will depart into the street" 3:60b:15; *kasap NÌ.MÍ.ÚS.A.MEŠ-ša (terhatīša)* "the silver of her bride-price" *ibid.*:14.

In the following sections, it will be assumed that MEŠ and HI.A do denote plurality, unless either the context or the grammar indicates otherwise. But it must be pointed out that this assumption may not always be correct. As will be shown below (pp. 311ff), a pl. subject may have a sg. verb, and a pl. noun may be referred to by a sg. pronoun. Thus, it is impossible to determine whether the subject is sg. or pl., e.g., in LÚ.MEŠ_{ub-ru...ul} *errub-ma* "The u.-officials may not enter..." 3:141:20f., or the number of A.ŠÀ.MEŠ in *FN šarratu tattaši A.ŠÀ.MEŠ...u tat-tadinšu* "FN the queen took the field(s)...and gave it/them"

²⁰Similarly for *hurāḡu* "gold": note GUŠKIN 3:99a:7, but GUŠKIN.MEŠ in 3:181:3(Ec.).

3:50b:2ff.

c. There are only two verbs in these texts which begin with an extra vowel sign.²¹ Both are I-', as is normally the case when this feature occurs in OB: G dur.: *e-ep-pa-aš* *6:3:26; D dur.: *ū-up-pa*²² 6:32:11.

d. There is only one example, apart from verbs II-w, of the doubling of a final root consonant before a vocalic ending:²³ *id-din-nu* (for *iddinū*) 3:59a:18.

e. There are very few doublings in the writing of consonants that should be single. As in K, the WS word *sākinu* "prefect" is most often written with double -nn-: e.g., ^L*sā-ki-in-ni* 3:36a:10; 6:5:3; ^I*sā-ki-in-ni* *6:11:1; but ^L*sā-ki-ni* *5:141:2.²⁴ The G perf. of *našū*, which is correctly written *it-ta-šī* over 70 times, occurs seven times with the second radical written double: *it-ta-aš-šī*.²⁵ The two forms never appear together in the same text. This is the only verb to exhibit this incorrect doubling in the

²¹This feature was discussed more fully above, p. 22. For other forms of verbs I-', see below, pp. 249ff.

²²Other occurrences of *uppulu*, and reasons for reading *uppulu* rather than (w)*abālu*, are cited below, pp. 250f.

²³See above, pp. 22f.

²⁴For K, see p. 23. In *5:145:1, read probably ^I*sā-ki-in<ni>(?)*; but cf. P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 290.

²⁵3:67b:4; 3:129:11; 3:131b:4; 3:148f.:3,15; 3:150:4; f. *ti-it-ta-aš-šī* 3:129:4 (vs. *ta-at-ta-šī-šu* 3:49b:16).

perf. The reason it does so is not clear; it is unlikely that the Gtn pret. is intended. The stative of *sakû* is twice written with double *-kk-*:²⁶ *sa-ak-ki* 3:110a:5; *sa-ak-ka!* 3:166:16'. The sporadic spelling *da-ri-it-ti* for *dārītī* (e.g., 3:70:19; 3:74:8) is probably Assyrian.²⁷ Note also the f. p. written with double *-tt-* in *qa-ta-at-ti* (for *qātātī*) "security" 3:37a:4,11.

f. A few unexpected extra vowel-signs for short vowels occur:²⁸ e.g., *sa-a-ki* (*sakī*) 3:162b:9; [ša]-a-na-am (*šanām*) 3:154:15; *lu-ū-uš-ku-un* (*luškun*) *5:140:30.²⁹ A unique spelling of a final long vowel (not due to contraction) is *i-su-zu-ū* in 5:173:23. The tense is not certain: dur. *izuzzū*, or pret. or perf. *iz(z)ūzū*.

g. Several broken writings occur. In verbs II-', these are normal: e.g., *iš-a-am* 5:8:18; *li-iš-aḷ-šu* 3:84:28. Other forms also indicate the presence of ': e.g., ^{LÜ.MEŠ} *mur-i* (for *mur'ī*³⁰) 3:162b:5. Incorrect broken writings are quite rare. In two instances, the 1s acc. suffix is

²⁶Perhaps the forms are Ass. D statives; see below, p. 286, n. 454.

²⁷Cf. GAG §20d.

²⁸This phenomenon is quite common in Akk. texts from Boghazkoy; cf. Durham, "BoAkk," 394ff.

²⁹Also *tu-ū-ha-ri* (for *tuhhar?*) in *5:146:11.

³⁰This is a Ugaritic word; cf. nom. *mru*, gen. *mri*, cited in UT §1543, p. 437.

simply "tacked on" verbs ending in a consonant: *iṣ-ṣa-bat-an-ni* *5:112:13; *li-din-an-ni*³¹ EA49:21. Such writings occur sporadically in many Akk. dialects, and are encountered (albeit rarely) already in OB.³² The ventive plus 2ms dat. suffix is similarly attached in *[ul-te-b]l-lak-ku* 5:100:r3' (cf. *ul-te-[b]l* *6:3:42, but *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 5:98:r20'). In 5:87f., a text that contains several other difficulties,³³ two words in a row are written incorrectly: *ū a-ma-at maš-ik-ta it-ep-šū-na-a-ši* "they did an evil thing to us" 11.30f. Compare the last word to the correct writing *i-te-[e]p-šū* in 1.18. Finally, note also the unique form *i-tu-ir-ru-ni* for *iturrūni* in 6:39:13.

h. There is a large body of evidence which indicates that, as in K, the vowels *i* and *e* were never necessarily written distinctly. This inference is based primarily on the frequent misuse, or interchangeability, of *Ci* and *Ce* signs, and even of the vowel-signs *I* and *E*. Note the following writings:

i-nu-ma 3:68:7, but *e-nu-ma* *3:5:9; 5:98:10; *6:12a:7;
a-na ma-an-ni-mi-i (for *mannim-mē*) 3:166:r10', but

³¹Acc. for dat. suffix ("may he give to me"); see below, pp. 200f.

³²GAG §7b.

³³E.g., *a-ma-at*, incorrectly in the absolute state (11.16,30); *i-i-tāk-ka*, probably for *i-l-la-ka* (1.12); note also *-šū* in 1.18, but *-šū* in 1.31; *[i]* *-[d]e* in 1.19, but *i-de* in 1.36.

ma-nu-um-me-e 3:64:13; cf. *mi-nu-um-me-e* Syl8:5;
 etc.;³⁴ cf. also [ma-an-nu-u]m-mi-e 3:108:19;
*hi-i-ya-šu*³⁵ 3:123:6,11, but *ē_{he}-e-ya* 3:87:r9'; *ē_{he}-e-ia*
ibid.:r7';
 -mi (particle of direct speech) *3:19:7,19,23, but -me
ibid.:14,18,21; etc.;³⁶
ša-mi-it 3:35a:8, and often,³⁷ but *ša-me-it* 3:146:10;
mi-im-mi-šu 3:52b:16, etc.,³⁸ but *mi-me-šu* 3:85:9;
 [mi]-im-me 3:146b:5; [m]i-im-me-e-šu 3:100:6;
 LÚ_{na-ia-lu-ti} 5:13:6, but LÚ_{IGI-te} *ibid.*:2; cf. LÚ.MEŠ
 IGI.MEŠ_{-ti} 5:10:2; 6:52:2; LÚ.MEŠ_{gi-bu-ti} 3:35a:2;
 etc.;³⁹
tup-pa-ti ša-ar-ru-ti 3:97f.:17f., cf. 23, but *mar-*
*kab-te*⁴⁰ *ibid.*:28.;
a-wa-te^{MEŠ} 3:108:19; *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ} *-su* 5:98:r5'; cf. *6:3:
 36 (all Bab. forms⁴¹);

³⁴Other forms are cited below, pp. 205ff.

³⁵This may be a Ugaritic word; cf. *AHW*, 339b; Nougayrol, *PRU* 3,216, under "Biens...(l d)," and 218, under "Castels..."

³⁶All forms are cited below, pp. 281ff.

³⁷See below, p. 234, n. 258.

³⁸See below, pp. 211ff.

³⁹Cf. also Syl8:249:4; Syl8:251:4.

⁴⁰A Ugaritic word (*mrkbt*; cf. *UT* §2331, p. 484, vs. *Akk. narkabtu*), as noted by Nougayrol, *PRU* 3, 98, n. 1.

⁴¹Ass. forms are written with *b*; see above, p. 24, and n. 30.

ŠU.BA.AN.TE *il-qè* for ŠU...TI⁴² in 3:105:52;

ti-še-em-me (for *tešemme*) **EA47:22;

li-ši-bu-ki (for *lišebbûki*) 5:148:10, but *û-še-ri-ib*

5:173:6,11;

bi-ri(-šu-nu) 5:173:5,21,22; 5:11:8,9, but *be-ri(-šu-nu)*

5:12:r5'; Sy28:174:8.

This evidence is corroborated by G third person forms of verbs I-',⁴³ in which the prefix vowel is unambiguously marked;⁴⁴ it appears as *i* 16 times, as *e* 11 times:

dur.

dur.

i-lak 3:105:54

e-ep-pa-aš *6:3:26⁴⁵

i-kal-šu 3:92:14

e-pu-šu 3:166:r9'

i-ru-ub 3:105:53,55
3:107:8⁴⁶

e-ru-ub-ma 3:141:21,24

i-ru-bu 3:98:26

e-ru-bu 3:163:r3'; 3:98:25

i-be-er 3:73:12,13

e-kim-šu 3:34f.:23

⁴²Cf. CAD L, 131.

⁴³No first or second person forms of I-' verbs occur in the G.

⁴⁴vs. e.g., *i/ek-ki-im-šu* 3:62:18.

⁴⁵For Nougayrol's *i-pā-aš* "will do" 5:183:11', read probably *i-ba-aš<-ši>* "belongs (lit.: is)". The scribe made another omission in 1.7': *a-kān<-na>*.

⁴⁶Perhaps also *la i-ši-ib* 3:76a:9, if this is either a *dur.* or *pret.* of the verb *ešēbu*, meaning "may it (the house) not flourish," as Nougayrol interprets it. In spite of the rarity of this verb (cf. CAD E, 352a), this is more likely than taking the form as a *pret.* of (*w*)*ašābu* as M. Tševát does in JSS 3 (1956), 237f.

pret.

i-hu-uz-š 3:76a:8;
18:253:14

i-pu-uš 3:34f.:6⁴⁷

pret.

e-ru-ub 3:139:17,20

perf.

i-te-ru-ub *3:19:11

i-te-ep-šu 3:72:5;
3:97:15,17; 5:87:18

perf.

e-ta-na-aš 3:108:16

e!(A)-ta-na-aš 3:110a:7.

If, for the moment, we discount the prefix, we note that only one form, *e-ep-pa-aš*, is necessarily Ass.; on the other hand, the following cannot be Ass.: *i-te-ru-ub* (*ētarab*), *i-te-ep-šu* (*ētapšū*).⁴⁸ The rest could be either Bab. or Ass. (*eppušū* and *errubū* with Ass. vowel harmony). Further, in texts 3:45f., 3:107f., and 3:98, both prefixes occur. Thus, it must be concluded that the U scribes did not distinguish *i* and *e* as prefixes of verbs I-ʾ.

The suggestion put forward above, that the scribes never distinguished the two vowels in writing, is not vitiated by the fact that, in the majority of cases, the correct sign appears. Most forms were learned by rote; therefore, any incorrect spelling must suggest that, for the scribe in question at least, a given sign *C₁e* had the same value as *C₁i*. This in turn implies either (a) that *i* and *e* were

⁴⁷Note also *i-pu-šu* **EA47:9.

⁴⁸It is quite possible that *i-ru-ub* and *e-ru-ub-ma* are pret., in which case they could be either Bab. (*ērub*) or Ass. (*ērub*). The pret. very often replaces the dur. in U; see below, pp. 345ff. If they are dur., however, they are Bab. (vs. Ass. *errab*).

distinct phonemes, but both could nevertheless be written with either *Ci* or *Ce*,⁴⁹ or (b) that *i* and *e* were not phonemically distinct for the scribe. Although neither alternative can be shown conclusively to be the correct one, one group of forms argues for the second, namely, certain forms of verbs III-weak. Consider the following:

dur.	dur.
<i>i-le(-eq)/leq-qe</i> ⁵⁰	<i>i-la(-aq)/laq-qe</i> ⁵⁰
<i>ti-še-em-me</i> ⁵¹	<i>ta-laq-qe</i> ⁵²
	<i>i-na-aš-ši</i> ⁵³
	<i>i-ma-aš-ši</i> ⁵⁴

⁴⁹An analogous situation must exist with the writing of the velar stops (*g, k, q*) and the dental stops and sibilants (*d, t, ṭ; z, s, ṣ*). These consonants are always distinguished in alphabetic cuneiform, and were presumably all distinct phonemes. But in the U syllabic cuneiform, most signs may be used to write any of the homorganic consonants of the group to which they belong: e.g., *GA* for *ga, kà, qâ*; *KA* for *ga₁, ka, qâ*; *QA* for *ga₅, ka₄, qa*; etc.

⁵⁰For *ileqqe*, cf. 3:49a:16; 3:109a:14; 3:72:15, and *p.*; for *ilaqqe*, cf. 3:92:12; 3:145:30; 3:117:r6; and *p.* There is a discernible development in the occurrence of these forms chronologically. As shown by the following table, *ileqqe* is found over twice as often as *ilaqqe* in texts from the reign of Niqmaddu II, but in all later reigns, *ilaqqe* occurs almost exclusively:

	Niqmaddu II	Arhalbu	Niqmepa	Ammistamru II
<i>ileqqe</i>	13	--	1	4
<i>ilaqqe</i>	5	4	11	32.

⁵¹"You listen" **EA47:22.

⁵²"She will take" 3:56:20.

⁵³"He will take (up)" 5:176b:5; cf. also *i-ra-aš-ši* 5:5:2'; *i-ba-aš-ši* 5:88:34.

⁵⁴"He will wash" (*mesû*) 3:55:13. On the sibilant, see below, paragraph o.

perf.	perf.
<i>il-te-qe</i> ⁵⁵	<i>il-ta-qe</i> ⁵⁵
<i>ta-al-te-qe</i> ⁵⁵	<i>ta-al-ta-qe</i> ⁵⁵
<i>iq-te-bi</i> ⁵⁶	<i>iq-ta-bi</i> ⁵⁶
<i>tāq-te-bi</i> ⁵⁶	<i>tāq-ta-bi</i> ⁵⁶
<i>it-te-ši</i> ⁵⁷	<i>it-ta-ši</i> ⁵⁷
<i>ta-ar-te-ši</i> ⁵⁸	
<i>il/ēl-te-qe-mi</i> ⁵⁹	
infin.	infin.
<i>le-qe-e</i> ⁶⁰	<i>la-qe-e</i> ⁶⁰

It is of course possible to account for most of these forms by saying that some are Bab. (e.g., *tešemma* (reading *te_g-*), *elteqe*, *iqtabi*, etc.), and others Ass. (e.g., *talaqqe*, *talteqe*, *iqtibī* (reading *-ti_g-*), etc.). But such a proposal

⁵⁵"He/She took"; *ilteqe* is found only twice: 3:86:5'; 5:263b:6; *ilteqe* is much more common: 3:34a:4; 3:49b:20; 3:59b:5; 3:63b:11; 3:64b:5; 3:87:r6'; 3:90b:5; 3:102:2; 3:130a:3; 3:146a:5; 3:167:4,15; 6:24a:4'; note also the pl. *il-te-qu-ū* 3:159b:6; *il-te-qu-ni* 5:9:4. *talteqe* occurs in 3:56:22; 3:62:4; 3:83:26; *taltage* in 3:64b:3; note *ti-il-ta-qe* 5:173:2; and the 2mp *ta-al-ta-qu-mē* 3:170b:8' (see below, pp 229f). No chronological pattern of distribution of forms with *a* vs. forms with *e* is discernible for the perf. as is for the dur. (see n. 50, above).

⁵⁶*iq-ta-bi* "he said" 3:76a:3; 5:81:23; 5:140:14; 5:176b:3; *5:112:10; *AnOr* 48:23:9; *iq-te-bi* 3:170b:7'; 5:183b:7'; *Syl* 18:249:3; *tāq-ta-bi* (2ms) *5:141:9; *tāq-te-bi* *3:19:5. Cf. *iq-te-bu-ū-šu* (3mp) *6:3:16.

⁵⁷"He took (up)"; *it-ta-ši* occurs p. (over 70 times); *it-te-ši* only in 3:167:19.

⁵⁸"She acquired" *Syl* 18:249:6.

⁵⁹"I took" *3:19:7.

⁶⁰*leqe* 5:20:2 (Ec.); *laqe* 5:81:12' (L).

would not explain the anomalous *iltaqe* and *taltaqe*, which appear to be unique to U.⁶¹ Obviously, there was a considerable amount of confusion. Text 3:86f., e.g., has both *il-ta-qè* (l.5) and *il-te-qè* (l.r6'); 3:64b has *ta-al-ta-qè* (l.3) and *il-te-qè-ša* (l.5).⁶² Since Bab. vowel contraction always occurs in these verbs (see below, p.260f), it is reasonable to assume that some, if not most, scribes learned typical Bab. forms, such as *inašši*, *tanašši*,⁶³ *ittai*, *tattai*,⁶⁴ and *ileqqe*, *teleqqe*,⁶⁵ *ilteqe*, *telteqe*.⁶⁶ Now, it is not impossible that Ass. influence gave some impetus to the confusion evident in the texts. But a more comprehensive explanation of the vacillation in forms is possible if it is assumed that there was no phonemic distinction between *i* and *e*. If this were so, all of the non-Bab. forms could be explained as the result of analogies to learned forms. Thus *Inašši* (with *I* representing *i* or *e*) could give rise to *IlaqqI* and *Imašši* (for Bab *imesse*);⁶⁷

⁶¹That is, apart from OA; but influence from that dialect seems unlikely here.

⁶²Cf. also 3:159f., which has *il-te-qu-ú* (l.6), and probably *i-l[aq-qè]* (l.20, vs. Nougayrol's *i-l[iq-qè]*; cf. the copy).

⁶³No example of this form occurs, certainly by chance.

⁶⁴3:49b:16.

⁶⁵Cf. *tešemme*, cited above.

⁶⁶No such form occurs, again, probably by coincidence; cf. ls *elteqe*.

⁶⁷E.g., by analogy to pret. forms: *Išši:I:lqI::Inašši:I:IlaqqI*.

similarly *tanaššI* to *talaqqI*, *IttašI* to *IltaqI*, *tattašI* to *taltaqI*, and so on. Conversely, a common (and learned) form like *IlItIqI* (*ilteqe*) could result in *IttIšI* (*ittēši*) and *IqtIbI* (*iqtebi*). The forms *taqtIbI*, *taltIqI*, and *tar-tIšI* would thus not necessarily be Ass., but due to the 3ms forms just given, and pressure to have *ta-* as the 2ms and 2fs prefix. A similar analogy could produce the (Ass.) infin. *laqî* (*la-qe-e*; cf. *ta!-mi-šu* 6:52:6). The form of one verb that is not III-weak was also influenced in this way: *il-te-ri-iq* "he stole" 6:48b:6' (cf. *il-tar-qu* *5:141:7). The pervasive use of the *TE* sign in these analogous forms is undoubtedly due to its use in the learned forms (*il-te-qê*, etc.).

Note: the system of transliterating and normalizing forms with *i* or *e* described for the K texts (above, pp. 25f.) will also be used in this part.

i. There are over 20 examples of D pret., perf. and prec. verbs, and one Š pret.⁶⁸ In three cases, the second syllable has (a+)e:⁶⁹ *û-ze-ku-û* 3:170b:13; *û-te-bu-û*⁷⁰ 3:

⁶⁸*uš-bal-ki-it* 3:84:26. Otherwise, apart from verbs I-w (e.g., *uš-te-qt* 3:169:25) and verbs I-³ (e.g., *û-še-ri-ib* 5:173:6,11), where *e* in the second syllable is due to other phonological considerations, no other Š pret., perf., prec. or participial forms occur.

⁶⁹Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 40ff. It appears that *šubalkutu* was susceptible to this change (in the appropriate forms); cf. *li-iš-bê-êl-ki-ta*, *uš-te-bê-êl-ki-it-ma*, cited in Aro, *Glossar*, 66, s.v.

⁷⁰*tebû* does not occur in the D elsewhere; see p. 247.

70:24; *li-š-i-bu-ki*⁷¹ 5:148:10. All three forms are presumably the result of analogies to (unattested) sg. forms, since the assimilation is to a following *i*-vowel (i.e., *uparris*→*uperris*). The forms are too few in number to determine if it is significant that all of them are III-weak verbs. It is unlikely that the *e* of the last two verbs is due to the fact that they are III-*e*; J. Aro's study has shown that, in MB at least, the assimilation in verbs III-*e* (e.g., *uredde/i*) is due to this MB phenomenon, not to OB vowel harmony.⁷² Examples of verbs without the assimilation are: *ú-sa-(ak-)ki* 3:140:4, and often;⁷³ *ú-ma-al-li* 5:180:10,16; *ú-ma-al-lu-ú* *Syl*18:252:23; *ú-ra-bi* 3:76a:10; *ú-na-ke-er* 3:105:56; cf. 3:134:10; *ú-kab-bi-i[t]* *Syl*18:250:25; *uk-ta-bi-it* 3:109a:12.

j. With one exception, *ea* and *ia* have uniformly become *â* in U:⁷⁴ e.g., *an-na-a* (from *anniam*) 3:160:21; *na-da-at* (from *nadiat*) 5:87:25; *i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* (from *ileqqeaš-šunūti*) *3:5:16; *-na-a-ši* (from *-niāšim*) 5:88:31. The exception is *ki-ia-am* *EA*45:26; **AnOr*48:23:8. According to

⁷¹I.e., *lišebbñki* "may they sate you"; cf. *AHW*, 1207b.

⁷²*SMBG*, 48. This is shown by the fact that forms such as *uradde/i* are equally common.

⁷³Cf. also 3:32:3; 3:107b:4; 3:110a:4; 5:181:4; *Syl*18:253:9. These examples, and the absence of a form *uzekki*, render *ú-se-ku-ú* all the more peculiar.

⁷⁴*GAG* §161,k. In 3:111:11, read probably *sa-ki-[ti]*. rather than Nougayrol's *sa-ki-[at]*.

the examples listed in the dictionaries,⁷⁵ this writing, with one exception,⁷⁶ occurs elsewhere only in a few other Amarna letters from Syria-Palestine.⁷⁷ In U, note also *ka-am-ma* (*kâm-ma*) 5:87:25.

k. Initial *w* has been lost; cf. *aš-bu* 5:87:22,24; *ar-ka-na-šū*⁷⁸ "afterwards(?)" 3:70:20. It is written in one archaic form, however: [w]a-šī-ib *5:137:7. Writings of intervocalic *w* vacillate between *w* and *m*: *a-wa-te*^{MEŠ} 3:108:19, but *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ}-*su* 5:98:r5'; cf. *6:3:36; *ū-wa-aš-šerg* 3:110b:4, but *ū-ma-'-er* 3:81:32; cf. 3:172b:5'.⁷⁹ On three occasions, the (probably) Ass. form of the anaphoric pronoun (acc.) is written: *šū-wa-ti*⁸⁰ 3:96:15; 3:146:13; *Sy*18:250:26.

l. As in K, mimation has fallen out of the U dialect: e.g., on nouns: *nī-īd-nu an-nu-ū* 3:164:14; *dī-na* 3:54:16; *re-šū-ti* 3:80:14; *e-pē-šī* 5:8:10; on the ventive: *īl-tap-ra*

⁷⁵AHw, 470; CAD K, 325ff.

⁷⁶An OB letter, ABIM 20:20, cited in CAD K, 329a.

⁷⁷From Cyprus (EA35:30), Qatna (EA53:41,61), Hazor (EA227:27); also from the same region, but specific place of origin unknown: EA56:38; EA250:15,35,40; EA292:27; EA337:19.

⁷⁸On this form, see below, p. 274.

⁷⁹The common word *aw/mīlu* is always written LÚ.

⁸⁰See below, p. 203.

*3:5:12; *il-te-qú-ni* 5:9:4; on dative suffixes: *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 5:98:r20'; [a]t-ta-ad-na-šu 3:83:28. It is still found explicitly only in certain fixed noun phrases: e.g., the first line of most legal texts is usually *ištu ūmi an-ni-(i-)im* "from this day," as in 3:121:1; but occasionally, one encounters *ištu ūmi an-ni-i*, as in 3:35a:1.⁸¹ Another common phrase that usually has mimation is *urram šēram* "in future" (adverbial acc.), as in *ur-ra-am šē-ra-am* 3:46:13; *ú-ra-am šē-ra-am* 3:53b:16; but note *ú-ra šē-ra* 3:97:10; *ur₅-ra šē-ra* 3:139:12; and even *ú-ra-am šē-ra* 3:49b:21, and *ur-ra šē-ra-am* 3:53a:27. Sometimes the adjectives *annû* and *šanû* have mimation in the acc.: e.g., *ni-id-na an-na-am* 3:59a:12 (but *ni-id-na an-na-a* 3:84:26, and so usually); *ša-na-am* 3:97:8; 3:105:52 (but *ša-na-a* 5:11:11). Since most of these examples are formulaic, and the rest quite rare, they must be seen as archaisms.⁸² Thus, as in Part I, word-final signs -CVm will be transliterated and normalized without -m:⁸³ e.g., *ša-ni-ta₅ p.* (but *ša-ni-ta* 6:62b:3); *KUR-tu₄* 5:87:25. Similarly, even though writings of the pl. allomorph of the ventive with -NIM are more common than writings with -NI, the former will be read -ni.⁸⁴

⁸¹Cf. also 3:45:1; 3:110b:1; 5:10:1.

⁸²As in K; see p. 27, n. 37.

⁸³In some forms, CVm's must be transliterated without m: e.g., *ša-bu-tu₄-ia* "my wish(es)" *6:12a:8; *i-na-bi-tu₄* "(if) they flee" 3:37b:9. Note also *na-ak-tu₄-šu* 3:207:15 (Ec.), but *na-ak!-tu* ibid.:14.

⁸⁴In the legal texts, the pl. ventive is written -NIM

When not final, mimation is retained, and the *m* assimilates to the following consonant: e.g., *am-mi-ni-im-ma* EA45:15; *il-tāk-na-aš-šu* 3:140:5; *šak-na-ak-k[u]* 5:98:13.⁸⁵

m. The treatment of *š* before a dental⁸⁶ is not consistent. In the letters, *iš-tu* occurs several times (e.g., *3:19:7,17; *5:140:17,21), *ul-tu* only once (*6:12:13). In the other texts, *iš-tu* is by far the more common form. It is always the form that occurs in the first line of legal texts (*ištu ūmi annīm*), and predominates elsewhere as well. However, *ul-tu* is found sporadically; in some texts, both occur: e.g., 3:59f., 3:62b, etc. Otherwise, in the letters, *š* has always become *l*: e.g., *il-tap-ra* *3:5:9, and other perf. forms of *šapāru*;⁸⁷ *al-ta-kān* 3:4:12; *il-tar-qu* *5:141:7; *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 5:98:r20'; cf. *6:3:42. When these verbs occur in the legal texts, they exhibit the shift as well: *il-ta-kān^{an}-šu* 3:134:12; cf. 3:140:5; *il-te-ri-iq* 6:48:6'.⁸⁸ In four other forms, however, *š* is

eight times, *-NI* only four times. In the letters, *-NI* occurs twice, *-NIM* only once, and that when not final: *il-la-ku-nim-mā* *6:3:28. All the forms are cited below, pp. 23ff. In K, the pl. ventive always has *-NI*, except when not final; see above, pp. 26f.

⁸⁵Probably also *šu-up-ra-a[m-ma/i]* *5:142:13.

⁸⁶Only examples before *t* occur.

⁸⁷Cf. *3:19:5; 4:294:11; 5:81:9'; 5:98:r2'; *6:12:16.

⁸⁸Cf. perhaps *it-ti-il-ta* 3:167:14, if from *ištēštu* (so CAD I/J, 282b).

is still written: *aš-ta-pā-ak* 3:110b:7; *uš-te-qī* 3:169:25;
uš-te-rib 3:64b:10; *t[u-u]š-te-rib* 3:55:19.

n. As is the case in K, in only one form does a root final dental or sibilant combine with -š- of a pronominal suffix to become -ss-: *[i]r-ku-us-sū* 5:3:5. Another text, 3:54f., has the perf. *ir-ta-ku-us* in l.5, but, strangely, *ir-ku-uš-šu* in l. 6 (see the next paragraph). In all other instances, no change takes place: e.g., *mar-ši-it-šu* 3:110a:11; *LÜ_{mu-ut-ša}* 3:65a:21,26; *Syl*18:254:16; *i-hu-us-ši* 3:76a:8; cf. *Syl*18:253:17; *li-ra-hi-iš-šu* 3:76a:9,13; *ik-ta-ša-ad-šu-nu-ti* 3:97:21.

o. Several forms suggest that there was some confusion between *s* and *š*: *sū-um-mu-uh/hu* 3:114:28; 3:137b:7'; 5:4:11'; 5:5:5', but *šu-um-mu-uh*⁸⁹ 3:58a:8; *ir-ta-ku-us* 3:55:5; but *ir-ku-uš-šu* *ibid.*:6 (abnormal assimilation to the suffix?; cf. also *[i]r-ku-us-sū* 5:3:5); *li-iš-la-mu-ki* for expected *lišlimūkt*⁹⁰ "may (the gods) be friendly to you" 5:148:9; cf. probably *sa-al-m[i-iš]* "amiably" *EA*49:26; *i-ma-aš-ši* "he will wash" 3:55:13, for expected *imesse*.⁹¹ Finally, for the 3fs genitive suffix, -*sa* occurs about half as many times (11; none after dental or sibilant) as -*ša* (20 times),

⁸⁹Cf., in a Boghazkoy text: *šu-u-um-mu-hu* *BoSt* 8:102:35, cited in *AHw*, 1017 (*samāhu* D 3).

⁹⁰See below, pp. 232f., n. 251.

⁹¹*AHw*, 647f.; cf. *ū-ul me-ši* "not washed" in an OB text from Alalakh (*AT* 126:36).

and *-su* occurs once for the 3ms genitive suffix; for references, see below, pp. 194ff. These examples are too sporadic to determine whether this confusion is of a phonological or merely graphic nature (i.e., read *su_w-um-mu-uh* in 3:58a:8?; etc.).

p. Nasalization of double voiced stops takes place in *ta-ma-an-g[ur]*⁹² 3:60b:12, but not *i-ma-gâr* 6:52b:6. The dur. of *nadānu* is usually *i-na-an-din*: e.g., 3:52a:24; 3:55:10; 3:154:21; cf. *ta-na-an-din* (3fs) *Syl*8:250:26. However, forms without nasalization are also encountered: e.g., *i-na-din* 3:75a:14; *ta-na-din-šu* (3fs) 3:53:13,15,16; *i-na-di-nu-ni* (3mp) *5:142:20. No nominal forms occur in which this feature, or the lack of it, would appear.⁹³

⁹²For this reading, see below, p. 244, n. 301.

⁹³Except perhaps the problematic *ma-ad-da-du* in 5:8:9; see below, p. 236.

C. MORPHOLOGY

1. Personal Pronouns

a. Independent.

For the third person forms, see under the anaphoric pronoun, below, pp. 202ff.

1s: nom.: *a-na-ku* 3:76a:5; EA45:18; etc.; *a-na-ku-ma*
*5:112:14; dat.: *a-na ia-ši* Syl8:249:5; *3:19:
16; *a-na ša ia-a-ši* **EA47:17.

2ms: nom.: *at-ta* 5:98:r13'; *5:145:9; *at-ta-mi* 3:114:
20;⁹⁴ dat.: perhaps *ak-kā-ši*!⁹⁵ *5:137:19.

1p: nom.: [n]i-i-nu *3:19:24.

It is unlikely that *i* and *a* were distinct in this dialect (see above, pp. 177ff.); if they were, however, the 1p form *nīnu* would be Bab. The 1s dat. form *yāši* is typical MB. The proposed 2ms form *ak-kāši* would be OB (see n. 95). The phrase *ana (ša) yāši* replaces the 1s dat. suffix

⁹⁴For *at-ta* in *3:19:11, see below, p. 275.

⁹⁵The line in question is read by Nougayrol: [ā](?) *ag-ga-ya aš-r[a]-n[u mi]-nu-me-e šul-ma-ni*; he translates: "E[st] comment est-ce que tout va bien [là]-bas?" There are a number of problems with this. First, *akkā'i* "how?" is normally written with the 'sign (cf. CAD A/1, 273); secondly, it is attested only in SB and NB. Most important, however, is that the interpretation is unlikely on semantic grounds; literally, it would mean: "How is all well-being there?"; but *akkā'i* is always used with a verb. I would suggest, therefore, that either *ak-kā-ši* is written (collation is needed), or that the word should be emended to that. *ak-kāši* (for *ana kāši*) would take the place of *ittika*; i.e.: "Is there all well-being there with (lit.: to) you?" Normally in MB and WPA, the 2ms dat. pronoun is *kāša*; *kāši* would thus be either an older form (cf. OB *kāši(m)*; GAG §41f; AHw, 462b), or a re-formation in U on the basis of 1s *yāši*.

(ventive), which does not appear on any of the respective governing verbs.

In four instances (*anāku(-ma)* in 3:76a:5; 3:83:28; *5:112:14; *atta* in *5:149:9), the pronoun occurs in verbal clauses, for emphasis. In 5:98:13', *atta* is voc. The other nom. forms are subjects of non-verbal clauses.

b. The independent gen. pronoun *attu-* does not occur.

c. Genitive Suffixes.

ls. L: note the following contrasts: voc. *ā-bī* 5:87:12, but nom. *a-bu-ia* ibid.:19,26; voc. *be-li* 3:4:9; 5:98:9,13', but nom. *EN-ia* ibid.:10,18';⁹⁶ *3:5 has voc. *be-li* (1.9) and *EN-ia* (1.26), and nom. *EN-ia* (11.9,18); 5:81 has voc. and nom. *a-bu-ia* (11.9,34); elsewhere, always *-ia*: e.g., *GASĀN-ia* (voc.) *6:3:21; *KŪ.BABBAR-ia* (nom.) *3:19:9; *ṣa-bu-tuq-ia* (sg.)⁹⁷ nom.) *6:12:8; *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ}-*ia* (gen.-acc. pl.) *6:3:36; etc.
J: always *-ia*: e.g., *ŠĀM-ia* (nom.) 3:170a:8; *Ē-ia* A.ŠĀ-*ia* *gāb-ba mim-mu-ia* (nom.) 5:11:6f.;

⁹⁶**EA47:25 has voc. *be-li* (1.25); the case of the immediately preceding *EN-ia* is probably gen.

⁹⁷The word is construed as sg. in OB (usually *ṣibbūtu*; cf. CAD S, 107ff.); thus, it is an abstract in *-ūt*. It may be so used in the present example, in which case, the vowel before the suffix is a sg. case-ending, a common phenomenon in U (see below, pp. 223f.). The word may have been felt to be a pl., i.e., *ṣabūtūya*, but this is less likely, since the predicate is probably sg.: *enūma sēr hurāti ṣa-bu-tuq-ia* "Since/Now then h.-seed is my desire..."

DUMU.MEŠ-*ia* (nom.) 5:176a:7; etc.

The contrast between the nom and voc. forms of *abu* and *bēlu* in the letters is striking. Presumably, the voc. forms represent holdovers from an earlier letter-writing tradition,⁹⁸ since apart from them, the *ls* suffix is always written -*IA*.⁹⁹ The precise significance of this writing, when -*ī* is expected (i.e., on nom.-acc. sg. nouns), is not clear. It may simply be a graphic convention, so that KÙ. BABBAR-*IA* would represent *kaspī*. The other alternative is that the allomorph -*ya* has been levelled through for all noun cases except a few (archaic?) vocatives.¹⁰⁰

2ms: always -*ka*: e.g., *qa-al-lu-ut-ti-ka* (gen.) "your service(?)"¹⁰¹ *5:137:7,8; ĪR-*ka* 3:4:3; etc.

⁹⁸Not too early, however, since OB usually has *bē-lī* for "my lord."

⁹⁹Once also in K for -*ī*: ZI-*ia* (acc.) 3:8:22.

¹⁰⁰If this latter alternative were the situation, KÙ. BABBAR-*IA* would represent either **kasapya* on the analogy of *kasapšu*, etc., or **kaspuya* (nom.), **kaspaya* (acc.), perhaps on the analogy of the MB development *abū/āya*, *aḥū/āya* (cf. GAG §651; Aro, *SMbG*, 67); an analogy with the gen. is also possible. The normalization *kaspu/aya* would be preferred if, e.g., *qa-bu-tu4-ia* (discussed above, n. 97), could be shown conclusively to be sg. But in the absence of clearer syllabically spelled words (e.g., **ka-sa-ap-ia* or **ka-as-pu-ia*), the matter must remain unresolved. Note that neither **kasapya* nor **kaspuya* (nom.) would be correct for the nom. in Ugaritic, where the declension of *kaspu* with *ls* suffix is **kaspī* (nom.), **kaspaya* (acc.), **kaspiya* (gen.); cf. *UT* §6.6, p. 36. The phenomenon of representing the *ls* suffix in all cases by -*IA* appears to be widespread in WPA. Further investigation, beyond the scope of this study, is needed.



¹⁰¹This word is not attested elsewhere; cf. *AHW*, 895a.

2fs: DUMU-*ki* 5:148:10'; *it-ti-ki* 5:173:26.

3ms: *a-ma-te*^{MEŠ}-*su* 5:98:r5', but *İR-šu* (gen.) *ibid.*:
10,r11'; *ni-id-nu-uš* 3:68:12, but *DI-šu-ma* *ibid.*:
14; and elsewhere always -*šu*: e.g., *ptl-ka-šu*
(acc.) 6:32a:9, and often; *mu-da-at-šu* 3:162b:7;
ē(bēṭ)-šu (nom.) 3:54a:20; (acc.) 3:48b:3,6,9;
and often; note DUMU.MEŠ-*šū* DUMU.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ-*šu*
(sic) 6:44:12.

Thus, the form is -*šu* in all but two examples, including occurrences with nouns ending in a dental (no examples occur after a sibilant). The only explanation for the single example of -*su* seems to be scribal error.¹⁰² The unique shortened form -*š* after a case-ending (*nīdnu-š*) is also difficult to explain.¹⁰³

3fs: -*ši* occurs twice: DUMU-*ši* 3:86:24; DUMU.MEŠ-*ši*
3:94:r10'; -*sa* is more frequent: DUMU.MEŠ-*sa* 3:
66:4,7; 3:114:29; 3:129:17; 3:137:16; 3:159f.:
5,¹⁰⁴ 19,23; *Lū_{mu-ti}-sa* (gen.) 5:5:8'; ŠEŠ(*ahī*)-*s[a]*

¹⁰²Perhaps -*šu* was intended; the only basic difference between the two signs in this text is a single vertical: the form in question is ; for *šu*, cf. *l.11*: . However, note that -*sa* occurs several times for the 3fs in other texts (see below).

¹⁰³In native MB, the shortened form is rare, and occurs with one exception only in literary texts; cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 54. In MA, -*š* is fairly common as an acc. suffix (i.e., on verbs), but not as a gen. (on nouns); cf. Mayer, *UGMa*, 31, 33.

¹⁰⁴Nougayrol's transliteration has -*ša*, a typographical error.

5:173:3; ŠEŠ(*ahā*)-š[a] *ibid.*:14; GIŠ_{sē}-*er-di-sa*
*Syl*18:251:7, cf. 8,9; in one text the m. suffix
 is used:¹⁰⁵ *mar-šī-it-šu* "her property" 3:110a:
 11; LÚ_{mu-ti}-*šu* "her husband" *ibid.*:10 (and cf.
 12); otherwise -šā always occurs: e.g., *e-mu-ša*
 3:53a:22; *šī-ir-ki-ša* 3:70:10 (and cf. 8,9);
 LÚ_{mu-ut}-šā (nom.) 3:65a:21,26; *Syl*18:254:16;
bi-it-ša (gen.!?¹⁰⁶) 3:53b:15; and 12 other
 times.¹⁰⁷

Thus, -šā is the most frequent form of the suffix.
 Whether the *a*-vowel represents good Akk., or an underlying
 dialect form, is of course impossible to determine. The
 reason for the *s* in -*sa* (and the unique 3ms -*su*, above) is
 not clear;¹⁰⁸ note that -šā occurs after a dental, whereas
 -*sa* always follows a vowel. The rare -šī is presumably a
 levelling through of the native Akk. acc. suffix, as in K
 where -šī predominates; see pp. 31f.); however, note that

¹⁰⁵The m. suffix is also used for the 3fs acc. in this
 text (see below); also, the 3fs verb has the same prefix as
 the m. (vs. normal *t-* in U; see below, pp. 228f.). The
 stative, however, is *sa-kā-at* (l.6). The use of m. for f.
 suffixes is common at Nuzi; cf. Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 39f.

¹⁰⁶The sentence is *a-na ša-ak-ni, bi-it-ša ta-na-din-šu*
 "She may give it to her 'major-domo'(?)." It is unlikely
 that *bi-it-ša* is the direct object here.

¹⁰⁷3:56:24; 3:65a:20,27; 3:60b:17; 3:62:14; 3:55:22,
 23,24,25; 3:110b:8; 3:146f.:5,11.

¹⁰⁸Other confusions of *s* and *š* are cited above, pp.
 189f.

-š*i* occurs only once as an acc. suffix in U, vs. -š*a* three times (see below).

1p: *a-bi-ni* 4:294:3; DUMU.KIN-*ni* *ibid.*:10; EN-*ni* 3:114:20 (bis).

2mp(?) or dual(?): *muh-hi-ku-ni* *5:145f.:21, referring to two persons.¹⁰⁹

3mp: *ip-še-ri-šu-nu* *3:19:15; *še-em-šu-nu* 3:60a:13; *pīl-ku-šu-nu* 3:142a:7; KÜ.BABBAR-*pu-šu-nu* 3:103:14.

3fp: *gāb-ba mi-[i]m(?)-[mī]* -š*i*-*na* 5:13:4, referring to two women.

d. Accusative Suffixes.

1s: *iš-ša-bat-an-ni* *5:112:13'; *ik-šu-da-ni* 5:87:24.

On the broken writing in the first example, see above, pp. 176f. The second example is from a poorly written text. The verb is probably 3ms, but could be 3fp (subject *elep-pētu*?). The reference is included here because *kašādu* usually takes the acc.; however, the dat. is also possible.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹See W.L. Moran, "The Dual Personal Pronouns in West Peripheral Akkadian," *BASOR* 211 (1973), 50ff. Moran takes *muhhikuni* as a 2m dual, noting (p. 52) that the acc. -*kunu* two lines later does not indicate that -*kuni* is a mistake. However, it must be remembered that this scribe made many errors (see above, p. 165, n. 3), among them twice writing -*nu* for -*ni* (22.8, 11), which suggest that the opposite inversion is also possible.

¹¹⁰See the discussion below, p. 200, n. 124.

2ms: KÚR-ru-ka *5:141:6; etc.

2fs: KÚR-ru-ki 5:148:8; *li-š-i-bu-ki* *ibid.*:10.¹¹¹

3ms: *id-din-šu* 3:109a:8, and p.; *lu-š-e-ri-ib-š[ui]* 5:98:r4'; *[n]a-ał-ta-pār-šu* 4:294:11; *il-ta-kân^{an}-šu* 3:134:11; *il-tāk-na-aš-šu*¹¹² 3:140:5; *li-ra-hi-iš-šu* 3:76a:9,13; *ir-ku-uš-šu* 3:55:6; *[i]r-ku-us-sú* 5:3:5; *iš-ša-bat(?)*-šu *5:111:B4'; etc.

Concerning the contact of final dentals and sibilants with the pronoun, see above, p. 189. Note that the only example of *-su* is due to that contact; all other examples are *-šu*. There are no instances of the short form *-š*, like the one in the gen. suffixes.¹¹³

3fs: *i-hu-uz-ši* 3:76a:8; *i-hu-uz-ša* Syl8:253:14; *ú-za-ak-k[i]-ša* *ibid.*:9; *[i]-ze-'-er-ša* 3:55:18; *ú-za-ak-ki-šu* 3:110a:8.¹¹⁴

On the contact of the final dental and *-š* in the first two examples, see above, p. 189. In the examples there are three instances of *-ša*, one of *-ši*. The number is unfor-

¹¹¹For *li-iš-la-mu-ki* *ibid.*:9, see below under dat. suffixes.

¹¹²On the ventive, see below, pp. 237ff.

¹¹³For *FN ilteqē-ša* "FN took it(m)." 3:64:4f., see below, p. 315 and n. 537.

¹¹⁴Note also *ú- [ru] (??)-ur-šu* *ibid.*:7, which Nougayrol translates: "l'a dévêue," on the basis of Hebrew *צר*. However, the form and meaning of this word must remain in doubt.

unately too small to draw any conclusions concerning the predominant form of this suffix in U. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that acc. *-ša* does not occur in K, and gen. *-ša* only once there; in U *-ša* occurs more often in both functions. The example with m. *-šu* for "her" is in the text in which *-šu* is also used for 3fs gen. (see above).

1p: *it-ep-šu-na-a-ši*¹¹⁵ "they did (an evil thing) to us" 5:88:31.

epēšu often takes a double acc.,¹¹⁶ and so the example has been listed here; however, it is possible that the suffix is dat. Originally the dat. suffix,¹¹⁷ *-nāši* is also used for the acc. in MB.¹¹⁸

2mp: *KUR-ru-ku-nu* *5:145f.:23.¹¹⁹

Note that the form is Ass., vs. Bab. *-kunūti*.

3mp: L: [*u/ut*]-*te-er-šu-nu-ti* *6:3:21, and cf. 23, 27, 29, all *-šu-nu-ti*; *i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* *3:5:16, 25, but also *at-ta-din-šu-nu* *ibid.*:24; *ad-din-šu-nu-ma* EA45:18.¹²⁰

¹¹⁵On the broken writing, see above, p. 177.

¹¹⁶Cf. *AHW*, 226a (*epēšu* G I 8). Another double acc. with *epēšu* occurs in 3:45b:4ff., quoted below, p. 362.

¹¹⁷Cf. *GAG* §42j.

¹¹⁸Aro, *SMBG*, 57, contrary to *GAG* §42e.

¹¹⁹See above, under gen. suffixes 2mp, and n. 109.

¹²⁰It is possible that this is a dat. suffix; the text

J: *ik-ta-ša-ad-šu-nu-ti* 3:97f.:21;¹²¹ otherwise always *-šunu*: e.g., in the same text, *i-ša-k-kân-šu-nu* 1.35; *iddin/ittadin-šu-nu* p. (e.g., 3:48a:6); *ile/aqqe-šu-nu* p. (e.g., *ibid.*:20); *u-ra-ši-ip-šu-nu* 3:125:12 (and cf. 13); and three other times: 3:53a:26; 3:82:18; 3:84:12.

The three letters with examples are unfortunately not enough on which to base any conclusions; still, it is noteworthy that *-šunūti*, which is surprisingly rare in J, predominates.¹²² The reason for this divergence in the text types is not clear. Note that no change (to *-ss-*) occurs at the morpheme boundary in *iktašad-šunūti* (see above, p. 189).


3fp: only *[-]ši-na-ti* in *6:3:39(L); the form could just as easily be the anaphoric pronoun.

e. Dative Suffixes.

These are quite rare. With one or two exceptions, they are confined to the letters, and to 1s and 2ms.

1s: *ta-aš-pu-ra* 3:4:10; *šu-bi-la-mi* *3:5:12; *tal-tap-ra* *3:19:5; *šu-up-ra-a[m-mi/a]* *5:142:13;

is too broken to recover whole sentences.

¹²¹Probably also, in the same text, 1.22: *id-du-uk-šu-nu-t[i](?)*. What remains of the last sign is ; Nougayrol read it as *m[a(?)]*; however, *t[i]* is equally possible; cf. the *TI* in the previous line.

¹²²Note that the examples with *-šunu* are both on *nadānu*, which in U always takes that form of the suffix.

i-na-di-nu-ni *ibid.*:20; *li-li-ku-ni* *ibid.*:28,
but in the same text, *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* 1.18;
note also *šu-up-r[a-a]n(?)-ni*¹²³ 5:87f.:35 (*il-*
la-ka-an-ni in the same text, 1.29, is diffi-
cult¹²⁴); *šu-bi-la-an-ni* *6:12:10; *li-din-an-ni*¹²⁵
*EA*49:21; *id-na-an-ni* *ibid.*:23.

It is of course difficult to distinguish between the related nuances "to me" and "here" that the ls dat./ventive suffix conveys. Therefore most examples of the suffix in sentences in which no other dative (i.e., *ana* plus a noun) occurs,¹²⁶ have been included above. The use of the ls acc. (-*anni*) as a dative, which occurs here as often as the simple ventive, is known elsewhere in WPA¹²⁷ (though not in

123 There may not be enough room for AN: 房 不 够 用;
the verb must be sg., however.

124 This form and *ik-šu-da-ni* *ibid.*:24, in which the suffix is probably acc., but could be dat. (see above), must be considered together. The text is poorly written. The scribe seems to move from sg. to pl. verbs at random. the verbs in question are probably 3ms, even though the subject in each case is most likely *elepētū* (f. pl.) "ships." If they are 3ms, the suffixes are both *-anni* (the one in l.29 for the dat. 1s: "they(?) came(!) to me"; the other probably for the acc. 1s: "they (did not) reach me"). Both verbs could also be 3fp. This is less likely, but if so, either of the endings could be a simple ventive (with *-anni* for *-āni* in l.29); or they could represent *-ā-nni*, i.e., the acc. suffix, for *-āninni*, a phenomenon found at Nuzi (Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 40) and Alalakh (Giacumakis, *AkkAL*, 33).

¹²⁵On the broken writing, see above, pp. 176f.

¹²⁶E.g., *il-tap-ra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka* "My lord has written (hither) to your servant" *3:59f. See the additional discussion under the ventive, below, pp. 237ff.

¹²⁷Often in Amarna texts (cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 27f.);

K¹²⁸). Perhaps it is a result of the confusion of other dat. and acc. suffixes;¹²⁹ or perhaps the simple ventive was felt to be an insufficient marker for the ls dat.: note that *-anni/-ninni* never implies simply motion to a point opposite the speaker (i.e., the ventive), but always a ls suffix, either acc. or dat.

In three instances, the ls dat. suffix is replaced by *ana* (ša) *yāšī*: Sy18:249:5; *3:19:19; **EA47:17; i.e., when *ana* plus the independent dative pronoun occurs, the dative suffix does not.

2ms: šak-na-ak-k[u] 5:98:13; ul-te-bi-lak-ku ibid.:
r20'; [ul-te-b]fl-ak-ku¹³⁰ 5:100:r3'.

As in the K texts,¹³¹ the distinction between acc. *-ka* and dat. *-ku* is maintained, and the dat. always occurs with the ventive.

2fs: probably *li-iš-la-mu-ki* "may (the gods) be
friendly to you" 5:148:9.¹³²

Unlike the 2ms dat., the pronoun here is not affixed

also at Mari (cf. Finet, *ALM* §17g, p. 33).

¹²⁸See above, p. 33.

¹²⁹Cf. *GAG* §42e.

¹³⁰On the broken writing, see above, pp. 176ff.

¹³¹See above, pp. 32, 34.

¹³²The verb is probably *salāmu* (*i-i*), in spite of the sibilant, and the vowel class; see below, pp. 232f., n. 251.

to the ventive.

3ms: [a]t-ta-ad-na-šū 3:83:28; perhaps]iq-te-bu-ū-šū
*6:3:16.¹³³

Note that the ventive is used in one case (as with
2ms), but not in the other (cf. 2fs).

1p: On it-ep-šū-na-a-ši 5:88:31, see above under
acc. suffixes.

3mp: On ad-din-šū-nu-ma EA45:18, see above under acc.
suffixes.

2. Other Pronouns

a. The Anaphoric Pronoun.

Included here are the third person independent pronouns.¹³⁴ In one instance, the nom. form, meaning simply "that" (i.e., not referring to a person), may be used independently as the subject of a clause; the text is broken, however:] šū-ū HA.LA-šū "That is his portion" 6:48b:7'.¹³⁵ Of course, when used independently, the demonstrative and personal pronouns are identical not only in form, but in function as well. Apart from the example just cited, the

¹³³At the end of an otherwise broken line; for Nougayrol's reading (as a prec.), see below, p. 232, n. 249.

¹³⁴See the brief discussion in Part I, pp. 34f.

¹³⁵Note that here the pronoun--the logical subject of the sentence--precedes the nominal predicate, contrary to normal Akk usage. This occurs elsewhere in U; see pp. 298f.

demonstrative occurs only attributively, and only modifying
ms nouns (undoubtedly by coincidence).¹³⁶ As in Part I,
the rest of the demonstratives (dem.) and the personal
forms (pers.) are listed separately.

ms dem.: nom.: A.ŠĀ.HI.A šu-ū 3:124:15; [A]ŠĀ.MEŠ
šu-ut 5:264:11; KÙ.BABBAR.MEŠ šu-ut 5:177:
15; gen.-acc. A.ŠĀ.MEŠ šu-wa-ti 3:96:15;
3:146:13; É.HI.A ša-šu 3:84:10; ANŠE ša-a-šu
*6:12:17; pīl-ka ša-a-[šu(?)]¹³⁷ 6:32a:12f.;
di-na ša-a-~~ra~~¹³⁸ *5:142:16.

pers.: nom.: šu-ū 3:82:20; 3:85:15;¹³⁹ dat.: a-na
šu-wa-ti Syl8:250:26; a-na ša-šu-ma 3:92:18.

fs pers.: nom.: šī-it 3:86:23.

mp pers.: nom.: šu-nu 3:97f.:20,24; EA45:17; *6:3:19;
šu-nu-ma 5:10:23.

There are unfortunately too few attestations to draw
any conclusions about the sg. personal pronouns in the nom.
It is unlikely that only *šūt* (Ass.) and m. *šū* (Bab.) oc-
curred. Note that both *šū* and *šūt* occur as demonstratives.

¹³⁶In *6:3:39,](-)šī-na-ti could be an independent
(anaphoric or personal) pronoun (acc.), or an acc. suffix.

¹³⁷What is seen after ša- is *š*.

¹³⁸What is seen after ša- is *š*. Nougayrol proposes
-a[(-)šī(?)]; however, there seems to be too little remaining
to rule out -a-[šu] entirely.

¹³⁹In 3:172b:3', read probably *ki-i-šu-ma* "likewise"
(see below, p. 277), vs. Nougayrol's *ki-i šu-ma* "ainsi est-
il."

The oblique examples show that for both dat. and gen.-acc., either *šāšū* (formally dat.) or *šuwāti* (formally gen.-acc.) could occur. This is a common phenomenon after the OB period.¹⁴⁰ *šāšū* is Bab., while *šuwāti* is probably Ass.¹⁴¹

b. For the demonstrative adjective *annū*, note the following examples:

ms nom.: *an-nu-ū* 3:161a:16; gen.: *an-ni-i* 3:117:rl1; acc.: *an-na-a* 3:137:14; fs acc.: *an-ni-ta* 5:87:26; mp nom.: *an-nu-ū-tu* 6:45:27; fp acc.: *an-na-ti* 3:145:27; etc.

Agreement of the noun and adjective is discussed below, pp. 314f. Rarely, *annū* occurs without a noun, although not as a true neuter pronoun "this"; the noun has simply been deleted: e.g., *an-nu-tu...šamatū* "these (grants) are transferred..." 3:90b:12, referring to the objects listed in the previous lines.

c. No interrogative pronouns are attested in texts found at Ras Shamra, but several examples occur in the EA texts; note: *mi-na-a* (acc.?) "what?" **EA47:25, and adverbial *am-mīni* (from *ana mīnim*) "why?": *am-mi-ni-im-ma* EA45:15;

¹⁴⁰GAG §41c, where it is also noted that in MB the dat. form predominates, as here.

¹⁴¹According to AHw, 1255f. (if the citations are representative), the writing *šū-wa-ti* occurs in OA, and at Alalakh (AT 3:42, MB level) and Boghazkoy. It is also attested in texts from Amurru (e.g., PRU 4:268:46; EA166:28), and from Byblos (e.g., EA85:72-*šū-wa-at*; EA138:117-*šū-wa-ti*).

am-mi-ni-mi *ibid.*:23; *am-mi-ni*, **EA46:7.

d. Indefinite Pronouns.

i. *personal*

Only one personal indefinite pronoun is attested in the letters: *šumma urram šēram ma-an-nu-um-me-e ša šarrutta ina libbi GN eppaš* "if in future (there is) someone who exercises kingship in GN" *6:3:24ff.¹⁴² Note the similar use of *amīlu mamma* in a legal text: *[šū]mma urra [šēra] amīlu mām-ma ša ilaīqqe* *eqlēti ištu qāti PN* "if in future (there is) someone who would take the fields from PN" 5:7:2'ff. In another legal text, *mannum-mē* is twice modified by a prepositional phrase, and thus separated from *ša*: *ma-an-nu-um-me-e ina libbišunu ša izziš ina dēni itti FN ū ša uqallil FN ummašunu* "anyone among them who would stand in court against (lit.: with) FN, or treat FN their mother disrespectfully" *Syl8:249f.:16ff.*; *u ma-an-nu-um-me-e ina libbišunu ša ukabbīt FN* "but anyone among them who honors FN" *ibid.*:24f.

Once, *mannum-mē* occurs as the (general) relative itself, i.e., without *ša* (as in the above examples);¹⁴³ the

¹⁴²Perhaps also *mannum-ma*, as Nougayrol restores in the next clause of the same text: *u šumma [ma-an-nu-ma ušam-rašūšunūti* "and if someone(?) maltreats them" *6:3:27. However, the pl. verb (or subjunctive?; see below, p. 313) renders this restoration only a possibility at best.

¹⁴³When followed by *ša*, the pronouns cannot be considered general relatives, but merely the (indefinite) antecedents of *ša*. For *mannum-mē* as a relative elsewhere, see

text is unfortunately damaged, yet the reading is quite certain: [ma-an-nu-u]m-mē-e ištū awāte [annāt]i inakkir¹⁴⁴

"(May DN destroy) whoever disputes these words" 3:108:19f.

Apart from these examples, the indefinite personal pronouns always occur with negatives,¹⁴⁵ in prohibitions, meaning "no one." There are four forms; in order of decreasing frequency, they are: *mamman*, *mamma*, *mannum-ma*, *mannum-mē*.¹⁴⁶ Note that *mannum-ma* does not occur at all in K, while *mannum-mē* is never used there with a negative. When they are used independently, all four forms are interchangeable. As

AHw, 603b (*mannummē* 2); and cf. the following sentence in a text probably written at Boghazkoy; the main clause is introduced by *u* (of "apodosis"): *mannum-mē ana ili šāšu niqī ša tapputti eppaš u qīšāti ma'diš ubbal* "Whoever makes offerings of association to that god must bring gifts greatly" PRU 4:223:37ff.

¹⁴⁴Nougayrol proposes the following: [ša mi-nu-u]um-mē-e ...i-na-qi-ir "[quiconque], de [ces] paroles, détruirait quelque chose." In part he bases the reading of the verb on *liqqur* in 1.19; and that determines his understanding of the sentence, and his choice of pronoun. But since *naqāru* is an *a-u* verb, as *liqqur* itself shows, it is more likely that the verb in question is *nakāru* (*i-i*) "to be hostile," which can also mean "to dispute, deny" (cf. AHw, 719a, *nakāru* I G 5; note also 5:95:31 in K). Since *nakāru* only rarely takes an object, the pronoun in question is probably the subject of *inakkir*, i.e., *mannum-mē* "whoever." (For *mannum-mē* as a relative, without *ša*, see n. 143, above.) Since *mannum-mē*, if correct here, would be the subject of its clause, it is in the correct case. In Nougayrol's interpretation, *mānum-mē* would be governed by the syntax of the main clause, and the acc. *mānam-mē* would be expected.

¹⁴⁵A possible exception may occur in 3:166:r10':]a-na LÚ ma-an-ni-mi-i [; the context is too broken to recover it.

¹⁴⁶*mamman* occurs about 60 times, *mamma* about 15; *mannum-ma* is found eight times, and *mannum-mē* only three (in addition to 3:108:19, note: 3:64b:13; 3:75b:8; 3:166:r10'; possibly also 3:76b:11).

examples of the same clause ("In future no one may take (it/ them) from PN"), note:

ú-ra-am še-ra-am ma-am-ma-an la i-le-qè iš-tu ŠU-ti PN
3:49a:15ff.

ú-ra še-ra ma-am-ma la i-laq-qé-šu iš-tu ŠU PN 3:77:9ff.

ur-ra-am še-ra-am ma-an-nu-um-ma la-a i-la-qè-šu iš-tu
qa-ti PN 3:159a:12ff.

ú-ra-am še-ra-am ma-nu-um-me-e la-a il-qè-šu¹⁴⁷ iš-tu
ŠU-ti PN 3:64b:12ff.

While the choice of one form over another may at times have depended on the individual scribe, not even this is always true, for in some texts, more than one occurs: e.g., *mamman* and *mannum-ma* in 3:46:14,21; 3:52f.:7,27; 5:15:r3',12'.

Quite often, the pronoun occurs in apposition, always modifying *amīlu* (cf. 5:7:2'ff., quoted above). Once, in a broken context, the form used is *mannum-mê*: *la-na LÚ ma-an-ni-mi-i*¹⁴⁸ 3:166:r10'. Note that in this example, the only one in which *mannum-ma* and *mannum-mê* are not nom.,¹⁴⁹ the pronoun is correctly declined. *amīlu mamma* is attested three times in the corpus: 3:82:14; 3:148a:16; 5:7:3'.

Otherwise, only *mamman* occurs with *amīlu*, at least 25 times:¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷On the use of the pret. here, see below, pp. 245ff.

¹⁴⁸For *mannim-mê*; the lack of distinction between *i* and *e* was discussed above, pp. 177ff.

¹⁴⁹*mamman* and *mamma* are of course indeclinable: e.g., *a-na LÚ ma-am-ma* 3:82:14.

¹⁵⁰*amīlu mamma(n)*, as opposed to *mamma(n)* alone, is found much more frequently in texts from the reigns of the later kings, especially Ammistamru II. However, there are no hard and fast rules of distribution.

e.g., *ur₅-ra še-ra LÚ ma-am-ma-an la i-la-qé-šu iš-tu ŠU PN* 6:29:22ff. In none of the examples, including this last cited, is there any obvious difference in meaning between *mamma(n)* and *amīlu mamma(n)*.

Once, *mamma*, reinforced(?) by *mimma*, occurs before *amīlu*: *ma-am-ma mi-im-ma LÚ-lu₄ a-na UGU LÚ-lu₄¹⁵¹ la-a i-ra-gu-um* "No one at all may contest against anyone (else)" 3:54a:13ff.

ii. impersonal

The only impersonal indefinite pronoun found in the letters is *mīnum-mē*, which occurs only before *šulmānu*. The examples are *mi-nu-um-me-e šul-ma-nu* 5:148:r8'; [*mi*]-*nu-me-e šul-ma-ni* *5:137:19.¹⁵² The expression means "whatever/all well-being." In the first example, the pronoun is in apposition to the noun, while in the second, it is a nomen regens.¹⁵³

In the legal texts, *mīnum-mē*, *mimma*, *mimmam*, and *mim-mam-ma* occur. None is found as a relative pronoun,¹⁵⁴ but the first does serve twice as an antecedent for *ša* in inde-

¹⁵¹On the incorrect case-ending, see below, p. 218, n. 192.

¹⁵²Note also, in the poorly written *5:145f., *mi-nu-mē-e šul-ma-na* (ll.7f.) and *mi-nu-me-e šul-ma-ni* (ll.26f.).

¹⁵³In the possibly K text **4:196f., as well, both constructions are present: *mīnum-mē haših₂tašu* (acc.) in l.10; *mīnum-mē šulmāni* in ll.6f.

¹⁵⁴The possibility that *mimmam* is so used, in 3:66a:9ff., is suggested below.

finite relative constructions; once, it is independent:

mi-nu-um-me-e ša ibašši ana yašši ša tarteši FN "anything that belongs to me that FN has acquired" *Syl*8:249:5ff.; in the other example, it is in apposition to a string of nouns: *u mi-nu-um-me-e maršitšu bītšu eqlētu gabba mimmašša ša iršū ana PN* "And any/all property, estate, fields, everthing of hers(!) that she acquired, belongs to PN" 3:110a:11ff. Note also the following economic text, where no relative clause follows: 17 GIS^Š []-na ir-te ū(?) GIS^Š ša-x-x-ma ū(?) *mi-nu-me-e* ME^Š GIS^Š.ME^Š "17 (logs?) of ...wood and wood of ... and all (other) wood" 6:95c:4ff.¹⁵⁵

Apart from the expression *mimma šumšu* (see below), *mimma* and the variants *mimmam*¹⁵⁶ and *mimmam-ma*¹⁵⁷ occur ten times,¹⁵⁸ with no obvious difference in meaning between them. In five examples, they are used attributively, in apposition

¹⁵⁵Another occurrence of *mīnum-mē* is in a broken context: *mi-nu-um-me-e* 3:66:18.

¹⁵⁶The two occurrences of this, in 3:66a:6,9, are apparently unique in Akk.; cf. *CAD* M/2, 73ff.

¹⁵⁷The form *mimma-ma*, which is not attested in U, occurs very rarely in OA, OB and SB. It is somewhat more common in peripheral texts, especially from Mittanni (cf. *EA*27:15;*EA*29:64,29,161). But *mimmam-ma*, which occurs in 3:150b:5', is found otherwise only in *Ea*170:7, an Amurru letter (and presumably also in *Ea*167:16, also from Amurru: *mi-im-ma-a[m-ma]*). Cf. *CAD* M/2, 79f. (*mimma* h).

¹⁵⁸All the examples are quoted in this and the next paragraph. Note also possibly the following: in independent use: *[mi-im(?)]-ma-a ina libbišūnu ul(?)*... "Not(?) anything/at all(?) in their midst..." 3:57:22; in apposition: *[di-n]a mim(?)-[ma...]* "(not?) any(?) case(?)" 3:98:33.

after a noun:¹⁵⁹ *pīlku mīm-ma yānu* "There is no feudal service" 3:116:r9'; cf. 3:142a:7; 6:45:26; *šīpra [mī]m-ma lā eppušū* "They are not obliged to perform any service" 3:166:48'f.; once, in apposition to a personal indefinite pronoun: *mamma mī-im-ma amīlu ana muhhi amīlu(!) lā iraggum* "No one at all may contest against anyone (else)" 3:54a:13ff. A similar example may be *m[amma(n)](?) mīm-ma ul ubaqq[ar]* in 6:34b:r2'f., if the meaning is "No one(?) at all may complain"; but it is more likely that *mīmma* here is used independently, as an adverbial acc.: "No one(?) may complain at all." Another example of independent, adverbial use is: *mārū PN u būlašu u Nī.GU₄ u gabba mimmūsu...mī-im-ma lā uqqi* "PN's sons, cattle, property, everything...will not go out at all" 3:114:23ff.

In two examples, the syntax is difficult to determine with certainty. One is: *[mī-i]m-ma-am eli FN... lā ittas-samūni* 3:66a:6ff. It is possible that here too *mimmam* is an adverbial acc.: "They may not complain at all against FN..." But when used adverbially, the pronoun usually stands immediately before (*lā* and) the verb, as in the above examples.¹⁶⁰ Thus, perhaps it is the direct object:¹⁶¹ "They may not complain about anything..." *mimmam* may also serve as direct

¹⁵⁹Cf. CAD M/2, 77f. (*mīmma* b 2').

¹⁶⁰Cf. also the examples in CAD M/2, 75a (*mīmma* a 2' b').

¹⁶¹Cf. CAD M/2, 74f. (*mīmma* a 2' a').

object in the other difficult clause, from the same text:

[*mi-i*]m-ma-am [*itt*]i FN...i/usa' 'izūni ibid.:9ff. Note that this is the only example in which *mimma* and its variants do not occur with a negative. If *mimmam* is the direct object, the sentence must be translated: "Everything was divided with FN..." But another possibility is that the pronoun is a relative,¹⁶² and that the main clause verb is lost in the lacuna that follows: "Anything that was divided with FN..., ..." The final example is in a broken context: [*mi-im-*m[a-a]m-ma : mu- 𐎎 [3:150b:5'.

A variant form of the idiom *mimma šumšu* "everything, anything"¹⁶³ occurs three times: *mi-im-mi šum-ši-šu* (acc.) 3:101:3; *gāb-bu mi-im-mi šum-ši-šu* (acc.) 3:68:5; *ga-ab-bi [mi]-im-mi šum-ši-ša* (acc.) 3:146b:5. These examples are the only times the pronoun stands before a noun; it functions as a bound form, since *šumšu*, taken by the scribes as a declinable noun to which a new suffix could be added, is always in the gen. The reason for the final *-i* vowel, instead of the expected *-a* is not clear.¹⁶⁴

iii. The pronoun *mimmū* is always preceded by *gabbu*, as it is in K.¹⁶⁵ Unlike K, however, *mimmū* is sometimes declined

¹⁶²Cf. CAD M/2, 78b (*mimma* d l').

¹⁶³Cf. CAD M/2, 75 (*mimma* b l' a' l').

¹⁶⁴*mimmi* occurs elsewhere only in the Amarna correspondence; cf. CAD M/2, 79 (*mimma* g).

¹⁶⁵See above, pp. 40f.

in U. Two forms occur in these texts: *mimmû*, with or without a pronominal suffix, and *mimmî-*, always with a suffix. In the letters, only *mimmû* (without a suffix) is attested, even though always in the gen. For examples of the rather peculiar distribution of these possibilities, see section e, below.

iv. The form *ayyānum-ma*, which occurs once in K, is not attested in U.

e. *gabbu*.

The normal word for "all" is again *gabbu*; *kaḷû* does not occur. The following are all the constructions with the word that are exhibited in the texts:

nom.: L: *gab-bu* ERIN₂.MEŠ 5:87:20;
gab-bu ^[GIŠMA].MEŠ-[i]a ibid.:22;
 [ga]b-bu DUMU.MEŠ 5:82:a
gab-ba DINGIR.MEŠ 5:148:7;
 J: *gab-bu* 5:174:31;
gāb-bu mīm-mu(-šu) 3:82:23;¹⁶⁶ 3:141:23;
gāb-bu mī-im-mī šum-ši-šu 3:68:5;¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁶The defective writing of the final long -û, when no suffix follows, is peculiar.

¹⁶⁷According to Nougayrol's translation, this should be acc. The sentence must be quoted in full: *ištu ūmi annim RN šar GN inaddin bīt PN₁ mār PN₂ A.ŠA.HI.A-šu GIŠGEŠTIN-šu GIŠGI.DİM.HI.A-šu GIŠ.ŠAR(KIRI₆)-šu gāb-bu mī-im-mī šum-ši-šu nadin ana PN₃*. Nougayrol translates: "A dater d'aujourd'hui, [RN], roi de [GN], donne la maison de [PN₁] fils de [PN₂], sa terre, sa vigne, son oliveraie, son verger, et toute (autre)

gab-ba 5:173:17,21;

gāb-ba 3:102:16;

gāb-ba mim-mu-šu 3:110a:12;

gāb-bā mim-mu-ū-šu 3:114:24;

gāb-ba mim-mu-ia 5:11:7.

gen.: L: *gab-bi mim-mu-ū* 3:4:7; 5:87:8; 5:98:7; 5:100:
5; *6:2:7¹⁶⁸

[a-na(?) *gāb-bi* L^UDUMU.KIN-ri **EA47:14;

gab-ba : *mim-mu-ū* *5:137:16f.;

J: *gab-bi mim-mu* 3:33a:5;¹⁶⁹

gab-bi mim-mu(-ū)-šu 3:118:10f.,14, and often;¹⁷⁰

gāb-bi mi-im-mi-šu 3:52b:16; 3:67b:5; 3:92:5;¹⁷¹

gāb-bi mim-mi-šu 3:112b:11; cf. 3:85:9;

ga-ab-bi [mi]-im-mē *šum-ši-ša* 3:146b:5;

gāb!-ba šu-ku-na 3:103:18.

acc.: J: *gāb-bā* 3:172b:5';

chose. Il le donne à [PN₃]." First of all, it is assumed here that *nadin* is passive, since there is no reason to take it as an active (note, e.g., *nīdnu annū nadin* 3:165:14; and elsewhere). Secondly, I would divide the sentences after PN₂: "Henceforth, RN, king of GN, gives the estate of PN₁, son of PN₂. His field,..., everything of his, is given to PN₃."

¹⁶⁸If *gab-bi* [mim-m]a(?)*-ū* in 5:81:6' is correctly restored, I am unable to explain it.

¹⁶⁹See n. 166, above.

¹⁷⁰3:113:8; 3:117:obv9'f.; 3:119:8,12,14; 3:135b:8,11; 3:143f.:6,10,12,15,18,23,26; 3:148a:6; 3:148b:5; 3:152:10; 3:168a:4; 6:31:9; 6:33:10,15.

¹⁷¹Note also *gāb<-bi> mi-im-mi-šu-nu* 3:58b:5; [*qadu gabbī mīi-im-me-e-šu*:3:100:6.

gāb-bā mi-im-mi-šū 3:48b:4; 3:53b:5; 3:60b:5;
3:71a:7,15;

gāb-bā mi-i[m-m]i-šī-na 5:13:4;

gāb-bā A.ŠĀ.MEŠ 3:97:5.

acc.(?): J: *gāb-bu* [3:58a:4; ¹⁷²

gāb-bi SUM.MEŠ-ti 3:120:r3'. ¹⁷³

unclear: L *gab-ba a-ma-te*^{MEŠ}-ia[*6:3:36,38.

As these examples show, there is the same confusion in U as there is in K, ¹⁷⁴ with regard both to the final vowel on *gabbu*, and to the case of the following word. With the exception of the last three examples, which are found in broken contexts, the observations that were made about the construction of *gabbu* in K hold for U as well. Thus, in 43 examples of constructions in the nom. and gen., *gabba* is declined, deriving its case from its context; in nine others, the frozen form *gabba* is used; in the acc., of course, *gabba* should occur either way. ¹⁷⁵ Note that the (pro)noun occurs five times independently, meaning "everything"; in one of the instances in which it is nom., the declined form *gabbu* is found, while in the others, we have *gabba*.

¹⁷²There is some possibility that the form is nom., but this seems less likely, given what remains of the context. However, see the commentary below.

¹⁷³The context is broken here too. It is possible, though again less likely, that the construction is gen.; see the commentary below.

¹⁷⁴See above, pp. 41f.

¹⁷⁵This renders the two examples in broken contexts somewhat more suspicious.

When *gabbu* occurs with another noun, we are hampered in discerning the construction involved by the fact that the second element is so often the pronoun *mimmû*, or a logogram. *mimmû* is apparently sometimes indeclinable, as in *gabbî mimmû(šu)* (gen.). In other instances, however, it is declined, as in *gabbî mimmî(šu)* (gen.); here, *gabbî* may be either (a) in apposition to the second element, which would then derive its case from the context,¹⁷⁶ or (b) a bound form, with the second element dependent on it. The latter must be the situation in the acc. *gabba mimmîšu*. In the nom. construction *gabbu mimmi šumēššu*, too, *gabbu* must be a bound form, with *mimma šumšu* treated as a declinable unit dependent on it.¹⁷⁷ Note that *gabbu* as a bound form is also declined, a common phenomenon in the U texts.¹⁷⁸ Finally, it can only be assumed that the acc. of the second element in the gen. construction *gabba šukuna*¹⁷⁹ is a scribal error, or that the word was diptotic.

3. The Noun and Adjective

a. Declension of the Unbound Form.

i. Most nouns are correctly declined; a few examples

¹⁷⁶The same is true of the nom. constructions *gabbu/gabba mimmû(šu/ya)*.

¹⁷⁷But note also the acc. *mimmî šumēššu*, without *gabbu* in 3:101:3; see above, section d, ii, end.

¹⁷⁸See below, pp. 220f.

¹⁷⁹For this word, see AHW, 1266a.

will suffice to illustrate the various cases:

sg. nom.: *mar-šī-tū* 3:57:18; *nī-id-nu an-nu-ū* 3:164:17; gen.: *i-na dī-nī* 3:72a:8; *a-na īr-dī* 5:15:r3'; acc.: *nī-id-na an-na-a* 3:84:26; *dī-na* 3:54a:16; pl. nom.: *īr.MEŠ-dū* (*ardū*) 3:57:19; *LÚ.MEŠ an-nu-tu* *5:142:28; note also *LÚ.MEŠ ū-ru-ba-nu*¹⁸⁰ 3:37b:7; gen.: *LÚ.MEŠ ū-ru-ti* 3:35a:2; *LÚ na-ia-lu-ti* 5:13:6; *qa-ta-at-ti* (for *qātātī*)¹⁸¹ 3:37a:4,11; *ē-ta-te* 3:147b:4; *[e]q(?) -le-ti* 5:183:6'; *A.ŠÀ.MEŠ ku-ub-sa-ti* 3:48a:10; *A.ŠÀ.MEŠ ki-na-ti* *ibid.*:16; *tup-pa-ti* 3:97:17.

There are several occurrences of Ugaritic plurals in *-ma*,¹⁸² especially in the economic texts; some examples:

nom.: *ma-qa-bu-ma*¹⁸³ 6:119:4; *A.ŠÀ.MUN.HI.A : šī-šū-ma*¹⁸⁴ 3:124:14; *A.ŠÀ.MUN : šī-šū-ū-ma*¹⁸⁴ 6:30:r2'; *TÚG pa-li-du-ma*¹⁸⁵ 6:101a:4; 6:101b:3; *DUG ka-du-ma*¹⁸⁶ 6:113:7; *LÚ.MEŠ a-šī-ru-ma*¹⁸⁷ 3:201:III:11;

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Nougayrol, *PRU* 3, 220 (under "Gages"). Note: correct the reference there for *urubānu* "garant" to 16.287:7.

¹⁸¹ On double writings of single consonants, see pp. 175f.

¹⁸² Cf. *UT* §8.7, p. 54.

¹⁸³ "Hammers"; cf. *mqb(m)* *UT* §1533, p. 437.

¹⁸⁴ "Salt fields"; cf. *šš UT* §2128, p. 475; Nougayrol, *PRU* 3, 229; *PRU* 6, 146, n. 4; In 3:125:r4', the word occurs with an adjective, probably in the wrong case: *[i-n]a : šī-šū-ma an-nu-tu*.

¹⁸⁵ A garment of some king; cf. *pld(m)* *UT* §2045, p. 468.

¹⁸⁶ A vase of some kind; cf. *kd UT* §1195, p. 417.

¹⁸⁷ "Supervisors" (?); cf. the verb *aθr* "to march" *UT* §424,

gen.: LÚ.MEŠ^{a-šī-ri-ma} 3:134:9; perhaps also ZI-ZA-
ha^l-li-ma¹⁸⁸ 3:166a:r6'.

ii. There are, however, many more incorrect case-endings in U than in K. Far more mistakes occur in the legal texts than in the letters.¹⁸⁹ In the latter, however, note: sg. acc. GAL-tu 5:98:rl8', and the inexplicably endingless writings of amātu in 5:87, quoted below, section e.¹⁹⁰

As with GAL-tu, above (and cf. n. 190, end), there is a tendency in the legal texts as well to use the nom. incorrectly for nouns that should be acc. or gen.; some examples

p. 369. The word also occurs in Akk. in Amarna and Taanach texts; cf. CAD A/2, 440b.

¹⁸⁸Meaning unknown; not attested in alphabetic cuneiform texts as yet.

¹⁸⁹The ec. texts also contain a number of incorrect case-endings, perhaps in part due to their abbreviated format. As in the other genres, there is a tendency for the nom. to occur where the gen. or acc. are expected: e.g., ša LÚ^{a-šī-ru-ma} 6:96b:4, cf. 5; [š]a di-ba-ra-tu 6:120a:13; etc.

¹⁹⁰There are two other possible mistakes in the letters. One occurs in *5:142:21ff.: šībūtu ša GN PN₁ mār PN₂ PN₃ qadu mārīšu u PN₄ LÚ^{ha-at-ni-šu} u akil lim amīlu annūtu lil-likūni "Let the witness of GN, PN₁, son of PN₂, PN₃ with his sons(,) and PN₄ his relative, and the overseer-of-a-thousand --let these men come here." It is difficult to know if hat-nīšu is governed by qadu or is a new entry, in the nom. (in which case the i-vowel is incorrect). Arguing for the latter alternative are the sense, and the fact that PN's are usually declined: PN₄ is ¹ad-du-nu, nom.

In 5:98:rl2', 15'f., there occurs the expression ina qāti PN LÚ^{ZA-ar-GU/KU(-)IGI-ia}. If this is to be read sar-qušīya, the case is correct; however, it is more likely, as Nougayrol points out (his n. 1), that sarku panīya is intended, in which instance, the -u is incorrect. For case-endings on bound forms, see below, paragraphs b, c.

are:

acc.: ^{LŪ}*ub-ru* 3:84:23; SUM.MEŠ-nu...*mar-šī-tu*₄ 3:
102:3f.;¹⁹¹ gen.: *i-na* 2 *me-te* KÙ.BABBAR *kàs-pu* 3:
169:14.¹⁹²

These (and in n. 191) are all in the unbound state; but mistakes also occur in nouns in the bound form, which in U often has case-endings even in the sg. (see below, sections b, c):

before a noun: acc.: *É-tu*₄ PN 3:52a:19'; gen.: *i-na*
DUMU.MEŠ *šī-ip-ru* LUGAL 3:105:54; *pīl-ka-ma* ^{LŪ}.MEŠ
mur-ū ^{LŪ}MAŠKIM 3:146:14; with suffixes: acc.: *pīl-*
ku-šu 3:126:24; *pu-hu-ka* 3:51:7; gen.: *a-na* PN
^{LŪ}GA-GA-*ru-šu*¹⁹³ 3:134:23.

There are other mistakes in case-endings as well, though they are less common: e.g., nom. *bu-la-šu* 3:114:23;¹⁹⁴
acc. *ta-ap-te-ti* A.ŠĀ.HI.A-*šu* 3:129:9. Note also [*ba*]-*tu-la-at* 3:66:11, incorrectly without a case-ending; see section e, below.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹Note also acc. *É-tu*₄ 3:47a:5; 3:104:29; *tup-pu an-na-am* 3:105:56; A.ŠĀ.MEŠ *qā-al-lu* 3:112a:5; 5/3 *pu-ri-du*₄ 5:8:6,7.

¹⁹²Cf. also *LŪ-lu*₄ *iš-tu/a-na muh-hi* *LŪ-lu*₄ 3:54:12,14. Here, however, the writing *LŪ-lu*₄ is perhaps to be considered a frozen form.

¹⁹³The meaning of this word is unknown; cf. Nougayrol's comments in *PRU* 3, 235.

¹⁹⁴Perhaps also in *ᵐLŪka-al-la la-a il-la-[ak]* "A messenger will not go(?)" 3:150b:r7'.

¹⁹⁵For constructions with *gabbu*, see above, pp. 212ff.

iii. The particle *umma*¹⁹⁶ "thus" is followed by the gen.:¹⁹⁷
e.g., *um-ma* ^I*a-mis-tam-ri* 3:4:3.

iv. The only instances of the locative-adverbial ending
-*u(m)* are on the frozen adverbial forms *ašrānu* and *panānu*;
see below, pp. 275ff., s.v. Similarly, the terminative-
adverbial ending -*iš* is found only on the frozen forms
danniš, *dāriš*, *ṭābiš*, all employed as adverbs; see *ibid.*,
s.v.

b. The Bound Form before Nouns.

Of the sg. bound forms which occur before other nouns,
and which are written syllabically (or as logograms with
phonetic complements), only a few exhibit the shape expected
in native Akk (i.e., no final vowel, or, with some noun
types, a final *i*¹⁹⁸). They are:

mi-ši-il A.ŠĀ 3:76b:6; *mē-hē-er* ^{NA}*KIŠIB* 3:97:16;
A.ŠĀ.MEŠ *aḷ-la-an* PN 3:131a:4f.; *i-na ni-is-sā-at*
ŠĀ-ša 3:56:24; LÚ.MEŠ *mu-de* LUGAL 3:134:12;

¹⁹⁶See below, p. 282.

¹⁹⁷Cf. R. Marcus, *JCS* 2, 223f.

¹⁹⁸I.e., nouns of the type *qīštu*, *tuppu*. The only
certain example of the former type occurs in *ši-im-ti* *Ē-ti-šu*
i-ši-im "He established the disposition of his estate" 5:10:
3. According to GAG §64g, the bound form of *šimtu* is usu-
ally *šimat*; however, *šimti* occurs in OA. In any event, the
form here does not bear a case-ending, since it is acc. Of
the second type, note *[tu]p-pu* RN 3:102:heading; cf. in ad-
dition the economic texts 3:192c:1; 6:68:1; 6:96b:1. Also,
if *ḫi* -*it* UZUŠĀ-*bi-la* "my heart's truth(?)" **EA47:21, is
read correctly, *kit* is an example of a short form of con-
struct, also seen in MB in the variants *muh* and *muhhi*; cf.
Aro, *SMBG*, 66.

LÚ₃šā-kīn KUR-ti 3:35b:6;¹⁹⁹ (cf. also nn. 198 and 203).

The rest of the sg. bound forms, over three-quarters of the occurrences, have a case-ending which would not appear in normal Akk. In all but a few instances, the case-vowel is the one required by context. (The errors were noted in the previous section.) Many of the examples are nouns of the type *purs*, although other types occur as well. A few of the examples follow:

nom.: *ni-id-nu* LUGAL 3:65b:14; cf. 3:64a:10;
be-el-tu₄ É 3:86:23; LÚ₃*ha-sa-nu* URU 3:135:15;
LÚ₃*mu-du* LUGAL 3:82:21; 3:80:18; 3:85:16 (vs. LÚ.MEŠ
mu-de cited above); LÚ₃*mu-du-ú* LUGAL 3:84:20; cf. 3:
114:31; *tap-te-tu₄* A.ŠĀ.MEŠ 3:139:19; MUNUS.LUGAL-*tu₄*
GN 3:51:4; É-*tu₄*²⁰⁰ PN 3:104:27; *mar-ia-nu* LUGAL 3:
80:17; cf. 3:193:24(Ec.); gen.:²⁰¹ *a-na ni-id-ni*
FN 3:53a:19; *i-na šī-ip-ri* É.G[AL] 3:150b:r4'; cf.
3:68:15; *ša-a PN₁* : *ha-at-ni PN₂* 3:142b:5; *iš-tu*
pīl-ki É PN 3:46:12; cf. 3:134:8f.; *a-na šak-ni₇*

¹⁹⁹This was probably no longer considered a bound form plus genitive, but rather a compound noun, *šakīn-māti*; cf. AHw, 1141a (*šaknu* B 2 a).

²⁰⁰Cf. also 3:70:21; 3:92:17,18; nom. for acc.: 3:51:10; 3:52a:18,19. The bound form of *bītu* when it is gen. is occasionally *bīti* in native Akk.; but, if the citations in CAD B, 282ff., are representative, the bound form in the other cases is always *bīt* in native Akk.

²⁰¹The form *qa-ti* 3:76b:12, etc., is found in native Akk.; cf. GAG §64c; Aro, *SMBG*, 66.

*bi-it-ša ta-na-din-su*²⁰² 3:53b:15f.; acc.: *pīl-ka*
é-šu 3:89:18f.;²⁰³ *é-ta*²⁰⁴ PN 3:52a:18; *ú-nu-ša*²⁰⁵
é.MEŠ 3:63a:17; *dī-na*²⁰⁶ FN 3:94:r3'; cf. 3:157b:7;
*pu-ha*²⁰⁷ *é-šu* 6:27:r7'.

For further discussion of these forms, see the end of the next section.

As in K, there are very few m. pl. bound forms written syllabically; those that are offer no problems: e.g., *a-na pa-ni* RN p. (e.g., 3:71b:2). Only one clear example of a f. pl. bound form without suffixes occurs:²⁰⁸ acc. *ku-bu-da-ti*

²⁰²It is unlikely that *bītšā* is the object, in spite of the fact that it is not gen. The sentence should be translated: "She gave it to her major-domo(?)."

²⁰³Cf. also 3:78:16; 3:129:18; 3:155a:12; 6:29:30; *pīl-ka-ma* 3:146:14.

²⁰⁴See above, n. 200.

²⁰⁵*unuššu* is a Ugaritic word; cf. *unθ*, UT §275, p. 363. It seems to correspond to Akk. (*p*)*ilku*; cf. Nougayrol, PRU 3, 227. Given all the other examples of a case-ending on the bound form, there is no need to supply *ša* here, as Nougayrol does.

²⁰⁶In the examples of *dīnu* in CAD D, 150ff., the nom.-acc. construct is *dīn* with only one exception, in a text from Nuzi: *dī-nu* DI.KU₅.MEŠ HSS 9:94:23 (cited p. 151b).

²⁰⁷The bound form of *pūhu*, in the examples in AHw, 877f., is normally *pūh*, in the gen. occasionally *pūhi*.

²⁰⁸In *a-na pu-ha-at* A.ŠA.MEŠ "as substitute for the field(s)" 3:50b:8, *pu-ha-at* may be pl. (*pūhāt*), since AHw, 876f., lists no sg. **pūhatu*, and the bound form of *pūhtu* is apparently *pūhti*. However, two points indicate that the example at hand is sg.: (a) the acc. form *pu-ha-ta* in 3:45b:6, which must either be a scribal error, or a sg., *pūhata*, a (peripheral?) by-form of *pūhu/pūhtu*; (b) *pu-ha-at* seems to refer to a single entity: what is being given as substitute

LUGAL "honorary gifts for the king" 3:99a:8. Note that there is a case-vowel on this bound form, as there is on the majority of sg. nouns.

c. The Bound Form with Suffixes.

The sg. bound form before suffixes also occurs both with and without case-endings. Many of the forms which exhibit a case-ending, however, are good native Akk.; this is true, for instance, of all examples in the gen.; e.g.:

a-na PN a-bi-ni 4:294:3; *i-na qal-lu-ut-ti-ka* *5:137:5,8; *ip-te_q-ri-šu-nu*²⁰⁹ *3:19:15.

Other nouns, such as *abu* and *emu*, are fully declined in Akk. when they have suffixes;²¹⁰ examples of these in U are: nom. *e-mu-ša* 3:53a:22; *a-bu-šu* 5:174:41; acc. *a-ba-šu* 3:55:12.

For nouns with *ls* suffix, see below.

is A.ŠA.MEŠ (1.3), which in spite of the MEŠ is referred to in 1.7 by the sg. pronoun *-šu*, and so is probably a single field. It was noted above (pp. 172ff.) that MEŠ very often occurs after logograms without indicating plurality. On the other hand, it will be shown below (pp. 315f.), that sg. pronouns are sometimes used to refer to pl. nouns, and so the matter must remain unresolved.

²⁰⁹This form could be pl., but the sg. is more likely.

²¹⁰GAG §65h. Von Soden also notes there that nouns of the type *pūs*, from *purs* of roots III-weak, are also declined when they have suffixes. Thus perhaps (acc.!) *pu-hu-ka* 3:51:7, could be considered good Akk.; however, the construct before suffixes (apart from the gen.) in the examples in AHw, 877f., is always *pūh-*. Similarly (nom.!) *bu-la-šu* 3:114:23, is the only time the construct of *būlu* (apart from the gen.), in the citations in CAD B, 313f., is not simply *buł-*. Another example that may either be normal Akk., or be exhibiting a case-ending, is (acc.) *tup-pa-ka* **EA47:15,18.

When the above types are discounted, the number of examples with case-endings (incorrectly, in native Akk.) is about the same as the number of "correct" forms, in contrast to the disproportionate ratio seen in the previous section.

The following are the examples with no case-ending:

be-el-šu 3:46:18; 5:15:r7'; *šul-ma-an-šu* **EA47:26;

mar-ši-it-šu 3:110a:11; *na-dā-an-ša* 3:65a:20,27;

LÚ_{mu-ut-ša} *ibid.*:21,26; (gen.) *bi-it-ša*²¹¹ 3:53b:

15; *te₄-em-šu-nu* 3:60a:13.

The forms with a case-ending are:

nom.: *pīl-ku-šu-nu* 3:142a:7; KÜ.BABBAR-*pu-šu-nu* 3:

103:14; *ni-id-nu-uš*²¹² 3:68:12; (for acc.) *pīl-ku-šu*

3:126:24; (for gen.) *LÚ_{GA-GA-ru-šu}* 3:134a:23, cf.

1.14; acc.: *pīl-ka-šu* 3:96:15; 3:129:17; 3:132:30;

6:32a:9.

In native Akk., including MB, sg. bound forms before nouns do not normally have case-endings,²¹³ and sg. bound

²¹¹See above, n. 202, on p. 221.

²¹²See above, p. 194, and n. 103.

²¹³The fact that there is an occasional case-ending (especially on the gen.) in OAK, and in the literary dialects (especially OB) is hardly relevant here; see I.J. Gelb, *Old Akkadian Writing and Grammar (Materials for the Assyrian Dictionary 2)*, 2nd ed., (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961), 145f.; see also GAG §64a. Aro, *SMbG*, 66, notes that a very few construct forms in MB have an extra *i*. These are not case-endings, however; some occur on short words, such as *šumu*, *qātu*, which exhibit constructs in *i* occasionally in OB (cf. GAG §64c); others, such as *bēlti* and *hasanni*, are probably due to analogies with forms like *qīštu*, *qibitti*. Aro also notes that some other written final vowels are due to sandhi.

forms with suffixes have them only in the gen. and in the few noun types mentioned above. Thus, the many abnormal forms encountered in these texts must reflect the native language of their authors, namely Ugaritic, where the bound form did have case-endings.²¹⁴ The only difficulty in this assumption is with ls suffixes on the nom., especially the forms *a-bu-ia* 5:87:19,26, and *ṣa-bu-tu₄-ia* (probably sg.²¹⁵) "my wish" *6:12:8. The ls on nom. forms in Ugaritic is simply *-ī.²¹⁶ Thus, these forms must be strictly Akk.; perhaps the latter, which should be *ṣabūtī* in Akk., if it is indeed sg., is formed by analogy with *abūya*.²¹⁷

The bound forms of pl. nouns with suffixes are regularly declined in native Akk. Thus, as with the gen. sg. and other forms listed in the first paragraph of this section, it is impossible to determine whether normal Akk. forms are intended, or whether these forms too represent the morphology of the scribes' native Ugaritic. The pl. forms are:

pa-nu-šu-nu **EA46:10;²¹⁸ *a-ma-te^{MEŠ}-šu* 5:98:r5';
a-ma-te^{MEŠ}-ia *6:3:36; *pa-ṭī-šu* 3:48a:11.

²¹⁴Cf., for the nom.: *ksu ṯbth* "the throne of his sitting" *UT* 51:8:12f., p. 173; acc.: *lyhpk ksa mlkk* "he will overthrow your royal throne" *UT* 49:6:28, p. 169; gen.: *lksi mlkh* "on his royal throne" *UT* 49:5:5, p. 169. On case-endings on the bound forms in other WS dialects, see above, p. 50, n. 111.

²¹⁵See above, 192, n. 97. ²¹⁶*UT* §6.6, p. 36.

²¹⁷The vocatives *be-lī* 5:98:10,r13', and *a-bī* 5:87:19, 26, are good Akk.; but they could also reflect Ugaritic morphology.

²¹⁸The form ^{LÜ}*ab-ba-e-ia* (i.e., *abbā'ya*) **EA46:9, is Ass.; cf. similar O/MA forms (nom.) in *Ahw*, 7b.

d. The Absolute State.

A few unbound nouns occur without case-endings: [itt]i FN [ba]-tu-la-at [š]a PN "with FN, the adolescent daughter of PN" 3:66a:10ff.; a-ma-at [la]-a ba-ni-ta "an improper deed" 5:87:16f.; a-ma-at an-ni-ta₅ "this deed" ibid.:26; a-ma-at maš-ik-ta "an evil deed" ibid.:30²¹⁹ The reason for the use of the absolute state in these examples is not clear.

In normal Akk., the construction for measurements and things measured is: number (absolute), measure (absolute), thing measured (case from context);²²⁰ an example would be: 2(šena) kakkar kaspā inandin "he will give 2 talents of silver." In the U texts, however, the measure derives its case from the context, and the thing measured is a nomen rectum in the gen., dependent on it. Thus, we find: 2 ka₄-ka₄-r[a]²²¹ KÙ.BABBAR-pt i-na-an-din 3:52a:23f.; 1 ka₄-ka₄-ra GUŠKIN...i-na-an-d[in] ù 5 ka₄-ka₄-ra KÙ.BA[BBAR]...i-na-[an-din] 3:154:20ff.; 1 GUN KÙ.BABBAR-pt...i-din 3:54a:17ff. In the first two examples, *kakkara* has a case-ending, even though a bound form (see above). Note that nouns after numerals are sg.;²²² cf. also 500 KÙ.BABBAR-pa 3:104:26,31,34,

²¹⁹This text exhibits a number of peculiarities; cf. the broken writing in the last example; see p. 100, n. 33.

²²⁰Cf. GAG §62d.

²²¹Nougayrol (followed by CAD K, 50a) reads: qa-qa-r[u(?)]-m[la(?)]. The copy, however, has ~~qa-qa~~, which looks more like the beginning and end of RA; cf. 3:126 (16.162), also from the reign of Ammistrumru, for typical RU (~~rrk~~; 11.2,8,15,19) and RA (~~rrk~~; 11.5,12).

²²²The verbs they govern are also always sg.; see below,

37.

The only numbers ever written syllabically (one, hundred, thousand) are normally in the absolute state: e.g., *1-en(ištēn)* "one" 6:98c:1(Ec.); 2 *me-at* 2 *li-im* "2200" 3:160:16. But in one text, "hundred" may be declined: *i-na* 2 *me-te* KÜ.BABBAR *kās-pu* "for 200 silver" 3:169:14; it is possible that this form is a dual (*me'tē*²²³), in the gen. case (correctly). *kās-pu* is incorrectly in the nom. (*kās-pī* is expected), perhaps because it is a gloss. The word *tāpal(u)* "pair" occurs only in the absolute state: e.g., 6:48:11'(J); 5:195:p.(Ec.).

4. The Verb

a. The Markers of Person.

i. imperative

The majority of forms present no problems. With one exception (*te-er-ri* (fs) 5:148:r9'), all attestations are ms. Some examples:

G: *i-din-mī* *3:19:21; *id-na-an-ni*²²⁴ EA49:23; *šu-up-ra-a[m-mi/a]* *5:142:13.

p. 312. In Ugaritic, numerals above 2 are usually followed by pl. nouns; however, the sg. does occur; cf. *UT* §7.10, p. 44. In Akk., the pl. is usually used; cf. *GAG* §139h.

²²³If this were in fact a dual, it would probably not be Akk., since it is doubtful that the scribes would have learned so rare a form; the dual was still used in Ugaritic, however, and *me-te* could represent the bound form, oblique, **mi'(a)tē*; cf. *UT* §8.5, pp. 53f. In contrast to this example, note 1 *me-at* [EA49:28.

²²⁴Acc. for dat. suffix; see above, 200f. These forms are Bab. (vs. Ass. *din*).

D: Bab. *gu-mi-ir* *5:142:17, but Ass. *qar-ri-[ib]-šu*
*3:5:28.

Š: Bab. *šu-bi-la* *3:5:12; *šu-ub-ši* 3:51:7.

The only problematic form is *dub-bu-ub* "speak" *6:3:37. The form should be fs; thus, either *dubbī* (G) or *dubbibī* (D) is expected. For other forms, see below under weak verbs (section e).

ii. *durative, preterite, perfect*

The use of these tenses will be discussed below, section 10. Only the forms of the affixes will be considered here. (Additional forms are cited in the following sections.)

The ls forms are with one exception typically MB: e.g.,
a-ma-at (G dur.) "(if) I die" *6:3:11;²²⁵ *il(ēl)-te-qē* (G perf.) "I have taken" *3:19:7; *lu-ū i-de₄* (G preform. stative) "let me know" 5:88:36; *ū-sa-ak-ki-ša* (D pret.) "I freed her" 3:111:9.

The only problematic form is *la-a a-ši-ib* "I will not stay" 5:173:26. Possibly, this is a WS (*yaqtul*) jussive, i.e., **aθib* (the Akk. dur. would be *uššab*). However, since (*w*)*ašābu* usually occurs in the stative in U²²⁶ (and always in K), it is more likely that the form is a 3ms stative, incorrectly replacing the expected ls *ašbāku*. No forms with

²²⁵Note also *la-lak* for *lā allak* "I will not go" 6:74:4, as pointed out by A.F. Rainey in *IOS* 3, 41.

²²⁶E.g., 5:87:22,24; *5:137:7.

prefix *i-* for expected *a-* occur, as is sometimes the case in certain Amarna letters.²²⁷

Typical 2ms forms are:

*tāq-ta-b[i]*²²⁸ (G perf.) "you have said" *5:141:9;
ta-aš-pu-ra (G pret.) "you sent" 3:4:10; *ta-ša-bat-mi*
 (G dur.) "you seize" EA45:24; *tu-še-bā-[al]* (Š dur.)
 ibid.:28.²²⁹

A 2fs verb occurs in **EA48:5: *ta-at-ta-ad-ni* (G perf.)
 "you have given."

3ms verbs normally have prefix *i-* (/e-)²³⁰ in the G, *u-* in the D and Š (examples *p.*). However, there are one or two possible exceptions in the D; see below, pp. 246f. No examples of a *y-* prefix occur.²³¹

The 3fs nearly always has a *t-* prefix; *ta-* occurs about three times as often as *ti-*, but there is no apparent reason for the choice of one over the other. It should be noted, however, that both never occur in the same text. Some examples are:

²²⁷Cf. B8h1, *Sprache*, 54f.

²²⁸Also, *tāq-te-bi*, e.g., *3:195; see above, pp. 181ff.

²²⁹In **EA47:22, there occurs *ti(te_g)-še-em-me*, with Bab. vowel harmony.

²³⁰See the discussion of the prefix of verbs I-', above, pp. 179ff.

²³¹In **EA47:24, Knudtson restores [...]*li-š[al]-li-i'*, but does not translate the form. Since it does not produce a recognizable verb, and since the context is too broken to make any sense, it is difficult to accept this as a unique example of prefix *y-*.

G: dur. *ta-pāṭ-ṭar* 3:60b:15; *ta-la-ka*²³² 3:107:11;
tu-ul-la-ad 5:5:r6'; *tū-šab* 3:56:25; pret. *ta-*
*din*²³³ 6:124a:edge,b(Ec.); perf.: *ta-at-ta-din-šu*
 3:50b:4; *ti-it-ta-din-šu-nu* 3:129:7; *ta-at-ta-ši*
 3:50b:3; *ti-it-ta-aš-ši*²³⁴ 3:129:4; *ta-al-te-qē*
 3:64b:3; *ti-il-ta-q[ē]* 5:173:2.

D: pret.: *tu-ma-al-li* 5:173:15.

Š: perf.: *t[u-u]š-te-rib* 3:55:19.

There are very few 3fs verbs that do not have the *t-* prefix: *uṣ-ṣṭ*²³⁵ 3:55:17, a text that has 3fs with *t-* five times in subsequent lines; *it-ta-din-šu* 3:50b:10, but *t-* in 11.3,4, cited above. Text 3:110a has two 3fs verbs, both without *t-*: *e!(A)-ta-na-ah* 1.7; *ša ir-šu-ú* 1.13. Note that this text also has m. *-šu* as pronominal suffix for "her" (11.7,8,11,12,14).²³⁶

Only one 1p verb is attested: *[n]a-al-ta-par-šu* (G perf.) "we have sent him" 3:294:11. Note that the prefix is *na-* as is the case most often in K,²³⁷ vs. normal Akk. *nī-*.

The only 2 pl. verb that occurs is m., and ends in (WS?)

²³²The subject is inanimate: *eleppašu* "his ship."

²³³In 6:110a:2(Ec.), *ta-din* is probably the Ass. stative (3ms); see below, pp. 362 n. 692.

²³⁴On the extra *š*, see above, pp. 175f.

²³⁵Compare *tu-uṣ-ṣṭ* 5:5:r9'.

²³⁶But the f. stative *sa-kā-at* in 1.6.

²³⁷See above, p. 53.

-ū, as opposed to native Akk. -ā: *ta-al-ta-qu-mī* (G perf.)
 "you have taken" 3:170a:8'.²³⁸

The prefixes of the 3mp are, with two exceptions, the same as those of the sg. (examples p.). Both exceptions have a *t-* prefix. One occurs in one of the badly written texts mentioned above, pp. 169f.: *te-ša-bi-tu*²³⁹ (G dur.) "(if) they seize" 6:50:16. The other is found in an economic text: PN *ša ta-ba-'* GN 6:74b:1f. Nougayrol takes the verb as second person,²⁴⁰ but this makes little sense in a list. It is more likely a 3mp, used impersonally, i.e., *taba''ū*:²⁴¹ "PN who is sought in GN." In both texts, 3mp

²³⁸This verb occurs in a relative clause, and the text is quite damaged a few lines earlier, and so it is possible that this is a 2ms subjunctive. But the mention of *ana ahhīšu* "to his brothers" in 1.6, and the almost complete lack of the subjunctive in U (below, pp 242f), make the pl. more likely.

²³⁹Note that the theme vowel is incorrect (Akk. *išab-batū*). Other instances of incorrect theme vowels are cited below, 243f. Since **yvqattal* probably did not exist in Ugaritic (cf. most recently T.L. Fenton, *JSS* 15, 31ff.), the Akk. *iparras* form would have been strange to Ugaritic scribes. It is tempting to interpret *te-ša-bi-tu* as representing a Ugaritic D **yaqtul*, i.e., **təšabbittū* (like Hebrew *yəqattēlū*); however, the other 3mp with *t-* prefix is presumably a D, and it has *ta-* (cf. also n. 241, below).

²⁴⁰He translates: PN "que tu recherches." A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 40, noting the oddity of a 2ms form in a text of this type, suggests that perhaps the form is Ugaritic **taba''a* "he has departed." This seems less likely, however.

²⁴¹In Akk., *bu''ū* is always a D. Most likely, *taba''ū* is to be so taken as well; but whether or not *ta-* therefore represents the Ugaritic prefix in the D cannot be decided on the basis of this example alone (cf. also n. 239 above). In *UT* §9.35, p. 82, Gordon suggests that the Ugaritic D prefix does have an *a*-vowel, on the basis of several *ysqtū*'s which he takes to be D's, and which have prefix *a*. It is doubtful

verbs occur without *t-* preformatives: note *e-te-e-ru* (for *itu(r)rū*) "(if?) they return" 6:50:16; *PN₂ u PN₃ ša i-qa-bu* ... "*PN₂ and PN₃ who say...*" 6:74b:3f. The forms with *t-* presumably reflect forms in the scribes' native dialect, i.e., Ugaritic, in which the 3mp often has a *t-* prefix.²⁴²

Two other verbs are, in some of their occurrences, marked pl. only by the addition of the pl. allomorph of the ventive to a sg. form:²⁴³ *i-tū-ur-ni* "(if) they return" 5:10:17,22; cf. 5:181:18; *Sy*18:252:18; *ip-šur-ni₇* "they released" 5:263a:6. There are no 3mp forms in these texts which have the WS imperfect pl. ending *-ūna*, common in many Canaanizing Amarna texts.²⁴⁴

There is no certain example of a 3fp verb. In 5:87, a badly written text, there occur three possibilities: *il-la!-ka*²⁴⁵ "they came(!)" 1.13; *ik-šu-da-ni* "they(?) ((did not) "

that *taba''ū* is related to Ugaritic *bḡy*, which occurs in the G, meaning "to reveal": *wank ibḡyh* (= **wa-'anāku ṭbḡayuhu*) "and I will reveal it" *UT CntIII*:26, p. 254.

²⁴²*UT* §9.15, p. 75. 3mp verbs with *t-* prefix are also common in many Amarna texts from Syria-Palestine; cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 52; A. Herdner, *RES*, 1938, 76ff.

²⁴³See below, 237ff., on the ventive.

²⁴⁴Cf. the examples in Böhl, *Sprache*, 53. J. Aro, *Afo* 18, 144, takes the frequently inexplicable ventive on many pl. verbs (see below, 240ff.) to be due to Ugaritic influence. Although he does not say so explicitly, he presumably has in mind WS **-ūna*.

²⁴⁵Nougayrol has *il-tāk(?)*-*ka*, which he suggests (his n. 2) is for *it(t)alka*; however, he also notes there that perhaps *il-la(!)*-*ka* is to be read, and he refers to *il-la-ka-an-ni* in 1.29. This is the much more likely alternative; the forms are probably dur. past tense: "have been coming."

reach me" 1.24; *il-la-ka-an-ni* "they(?) came to me" 1.29. The subject is *eleppētu* (f. pl.) "ships," in the first example certainly, in the other two probably. But since the scribe vacillates most strangely between sg. and pl. verbs throughout the text,²⁴⁶ I prefer to take all of these examples as 3ms.²⁴⁷ The first would be ventive; the other two would have the suffix *-anni*.²⁴⁸ For sg. verbs with pl. subjects, see below, p. 313.

iii. *precativē*

There are no problematic forms;²⁴⁹ some examples:

G: 1s: Bab. *lu-ū-uš-ku-un*²⁵⁰ *5:140:30; third person forms are both Bab. and Ass.; 3ms: *li-id-bu-ub* 5:98:r7'; *li-din-an-ni* EA49:21; etc.; 3mp: *li/e-ru-bu* *5:142:29; etc.²⁵¹

²⁴⁶This is discussed in more detail below, pp. 312f.

²⁴⁷Against this interpretation, however, might be *eleppāšu ta-la-ka* "(if) his ship comes" 3:107:11.

²⁴⁸The suffixes (or ventive) on these are discussed above, p. 200, n. 124.

²⁴⁹In *6:3:16,17, Nougayrol suggests restoring two prec.'s: [*li*](?) *-iq-te-bu-ū-su* and [*li*](?) *-it-t[al]-bal*, on the basis of [*li*] *-iš-ku-nu* in 1.15. These forms are all that can be read in their respective lines. But, since no other prec.'s in U are based on the perf., and since there is no context at all, it is almost certain that these forms are simply perf.'s (*iqtebūšu*, *ittabal*), especially since the prec.'s in 11.15,23 are correctly formed.

²⁵⁰The extra vowel sign is unusual.

²⁵¹In 5:148:9, (*ilānu*) *li-iš-la-mu-ki*, like the clause that follows it (see below, p. 260, n. 369), must be compared with Ug. 5:131, a text of unknown origin, where we

D: 1s: the only example may be Bab. or Ass.: *lu-ga-mi-ir-mi*²⁵² *5:142:15; all third person forms but one are Bab.: 3ms: *li-hal-li-iq* 3:105:57; etc., but Ass. *lu-ū-ma-[al-li]* 5:7:5,²⁵³ 3mp: *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* *5:142:18; etc.

Š: the following are all the attested forms: 3ms:

Bab. *li-še-r[i-ib-šu]* 5:98:r7', but Ass. *lu-še-ri-ib-š[u]* *ibid.*:r4', and *[l]u-še-bi-la* *ibid.*:r11'.

No f. forms, either *liprus* or *lū taprus*,²⁵⁴ occur.

have (*ilānu*) *li-s/šal-la-mu-ka* in 1.3'. It is difficult to determine which form is the "correct" one. Both have problems: the former should be from *salāmu* "to be friendly" (in spite of the sibilant--read *ts?*--and the wrong vowel class), since *šalāmu* G would make little sense. If the verb is *salāmu*, the pronoun would then be dat.: "may (the gods) be friendly to you." The latter, if it is a D, should have *i* in the third syllable, and would be from *šullumu*, since with *sullumu* men are the subject, gods the object, not vice versa, as here (cf. *AHW*, 1014b), and since the suffix (-ka) is acc., not dat. (-ku). I see no way to explain both forms satisfactorily.

²⁵²Cf. P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 290. Mougayrol read *lu ga-mi-ir-mi*, and translated: "Que c'(en) soit terminé." This is possible, of course; note however that *lū* is always written *lu-ū* in U (see below, p. 321). For *gummuru* in the sense "to render a final verdict," clearly the meaning here, cf. *CAD* G, 30 (*gamāru* 3 f).

²⁵³It is not likely that the form should be read *lu ū-ma-[al-li]* with asseverative *lū*; even if the form ended with -*li* (as is most probable; see below, pp. 245f.), and was thus pret., it would be a pret. replacing a dur. (a common phenomenon in U; see below, pp. 345ff.), since the meaning must be future. But asseverative *lū* is never used with the dur. (in native Akk., at least); cf. *GAG* §81f. Moreover, *lū* is elsewhere in U always written *lu-ū*.

²⁵⁴A. Ungnad and L. Matouš, *Grammatik des Akkadischen* 5th ed. (München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1969) §60a, p. 69; cf. *GAG*, p. 10*, paradigm 10.

iv. *stative*²⁵⁵

Examples of 1s, 3mp, 3fs, and 3mp statives occur. Most are formed correctly, but there are a number of problems.

In the G, note the following examples:

1s: *mar-ša-k[u]* *6:3:9; 3ms: *na-ker* 3:68:7; *a-ni-ih* 3:84:24; *šak-na-ak-k[u]* 5:98:13; probably also *ta-din* 6:110a:2(Ec.), the Ass. stative of *n/tadānu*²⁵⁶
3fs: *ha-aš-ha-at(-ma)* 3:53b:11,13; *na-da-at* 5:87:25;
3mp: *sā-ar-ru* 3:98:24; *aš-bu* 5:87:22,24; etc.

The verb *šamātu*²⁵⁷ "to transfer," which is unique to U, usually has as stative *ša-mi-it*, as in 3:126:17; etc.²⁵⁸ However, it is occasionally *ša-ma-at*, as in 5:9:11.²⁵⁹ The reason for this variation may be that the scribes believed that all Akk. statives had *i*-vowels, whereas, perhaps, the "perfect" of this verb in Ugaritic was **šamata*. Two forms support this suggestion: *ra-pī-iš* 5:8:8, which should be *rapāš*;²⁶⁰ and *ša-ma-t[a]* 3:52a:16, which probably exhibits

²⁵⁵The presentation of the stative in this study is discussed in the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

²⁵⁶See below, p. 362, n. 692.

²⁵⁷Discussed at length in CAD S, 93ff., especially 94b. See also O. Loretz, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 1962, 269ff.

²⁵⁸The other syllabically written occurrences are: 3:35a:8; 3:96:19,22; 3:99b:9; 3:121:10; 3:126:14; 3:127f.:10,25; 3:129:16; 3:130:8,10; 3:138f.:9,22,26; 3:142a:10; 3:143:8; 3:146:10; 3:160:17; 3:161b:12; 3:173c:4'; 5:8f.:14,23; 5:263:11, 6:29:20.

²⁵⁹Also 3:36a:9; 3:87:r9'; 3:113:7; 5:179:6; 6:62c:4. Note also the pl. *ša-ma-tū* 3:90b:13.

²⁶⁰Cf. AHw, 955a.

the Ugaritic perfect 3ms morpheme *-a rather than the Akk. ventive;²⁶¹ cf. also the unique D form of *ṣamatu*, also with -a: *ṣū-um-mu-ta* (as a gloss for ŠAM.TIL.LA. [ŠE] ²⁶²) 3:63b: 12. Thus, *ṣamit* would have been considered the correct form, and *ṣamat* a lapsus. A similar alternation in the theme vowel is found in the verb *sakû*; usually, the stative is *sa-ki*, as in 3:68:16; etc.²⁶³ But several times, a form with -a occurs: e.g., *sa-ka*₄ 3:33a:6; *sa-ak-ka*! 3:166:16'; *sa-ka*₄-a 6:39:8; 6:52b:8.²⁶⁴ Again, it is doubtful that the forms with -a are ventives; more likely, they represent WS *qatala's.

A difficult sentence is the following: *ilna(?) libbi māti annīti [x x(?)] R(?)*. MEŠ ša bēlīya lu-ū ga-am-ru *6:3: 30f. It is likely that the subject (pl.) of *gamrū* was in the lacuna, and that the sentence means: "In this land, may the [...] of my lord's servants(?) be completed."²⁶⁵

²⁶¹Cf. *yṣa*(=**yāṣa*'a "went out") *UT I Aqht*:75, p. 245, 2100:21, p. 26*. If this were so, it would also explain the lack of contraction in *ṣa-ma-t[a]* (cf. *šak-na-ak-k[u]* above), and in the pl. *ṣa-ma-tū* 3:90b:13 (cf. *ga-am-ru* below). See further, pp. 237ff., on the ventive.

²⁶²Correct CAD Š, 94a; there is no BI in the copy.

²⁶³Also 3:46:11; 3:54a:12; 3:70:18,20; 3:78:14(bis); 3:82:12,19; 5:15:r3',10'; 6:48:16'; and note *sa-a-ki* 3:162b:9, and *sa-ak-ki* 3:110a:5.

²⁶⁴Perhaps also *[sa-kā-a] (?)* 3:102:21; *sa-ku* in 5:182:5' is probably a pl.

²⁶⁵Nougayrol translates: "[au] sein(?) de ce pays, tous (les gens) sont [des serviteurs de mon maître]." This is impossible both semantically, since *gamru* as an adjective does not modify people (cf. CAD G, 37f.), and syntactically, since literally the sentence would have to mean: "In this land the servants of my lord are indeed all."

The form *ha-tā-ad-dū* in 5:98:12 is also difficult; Nou-gayrol's transliteration (followed here) indicates that he considered it to be a Gtn stative, 3ms, of *hadū*. Although that should be *hitaddu*,²⁶⁶ it remains the most likely proposal.²⁶⁷

All D statives are Bab.:

sū-um-mu-uh 3:114:28 (but *šū-um-mu-uh*²⁶⁸ 3:58a:8);
ṣu-um-mu-ta 3:63b:12 (see above); 3mp: *sū-um-mu-hu*
 3:137b:7'; 5:5:5'.

The form *ma-ad-da-du* in 5:8:9 is very puzzling; the sentence is: *PN u FN aššatšū ipšūrūni 5 pu-ri-du₄ A.ŠĀ : GĪD.DA ū 3 pu-ri-du₄ A.ŠĀ ra-pē-iš ma-ad-da-du* "PN and his wife FN released a field 5 p. in length (lit.: it is long) by 3 p. in width (lit.: it is wide); they (i.e., length and width?) were surveyed(?)." Even if this interpretation is correct, the last word should be *maddū*²⁶⁹ (G) or *muddudū* (D).

An N stative may occur in the following clause: *PN₁ u PN₂ mār PN₃ na-ap-ṭa-ru eq₁la ina eq₁li* "PN₁ and PN₂ son of PN₃ .?. field for field" 3:89a:4. The lines following this make it clear that the two individuals exchanged property.

²⁶⁶Cf. AHw, 307b (*hadū* Gtn); GAG, p. 41*, paradigm 32.

²⁶⁷I fail to understand P.-R. Berger's suggestion (UF 2, 287) to read "*ha-da-at-ti* = *hadātī*, 'assyrischer' Stativ," unless he means an Assyrianized (-*tt*-?), WS 1s form (-*tī*).

²⁶⁸See above, pp. 189f.

²⁶⁹Perhaps the -*da*- should be omitted: *ma-ad-<da>du*.

Both Nougayrol²⁷⁰ and von Soden²⁷¹ take *na-ap-ṭa-ru* as a deverbal noun, the former as a "nom employé au statif," meaning "délogeants," and the latter unsure of its meaning. But perhaps the form is an N stative, 3mp with a reciprocal nuance: "they released to each other."²⁷²

No Š statives are attested.

b. The Ventive.

The allomorphs of the ventive are: *-a(m)*, on sg. verb forms;²⁷³ *-ni(m)*, on pl. forms.²⁷⁴ Mimination has been lost, except when not final (see above, 186ff.). In four examples of *tāru* and one example of *pašāru*, the pl. is formed simply by adding *-ni*₍₇₎ directly to the sg. verb: *šumma...PN u mārušu i-tū-ur-ni* "if...PN and his sons return" 5:9f.:15ff.;

²⁷⁰See PRU 3, 219 (under "Echanges") and 223 (*paṭāru*); Nougayrol translates the form as a verb ("délogent(?)"), however.

²⁷¹AHW, 742a.

²⁷²Against this interpretation, it must be admitted, is the clearly nominal form *na-ap-ṭa-ra* (*lā ubbal*) "(He will not bear) any ..." in 3:80:15f. Whatever the meaning there, however, it does not seem to be the same as in 3:89a:5. If it is in fact an N verb, perhaps it represents a WS N *qatala*, since the N stative is quite rare in Akk.

²⁷³No 2fs or lp forms occur with the ventive.

²⁷⁴There is a slight possibility that two verbs in 5:87 (*ik-šu-da-ni* in l.24 and *il-la-ka-an-ni* in l.29) are 3fp, with the ls acc suffix. If so, the ventive plus ls suffix, which should be *-āninni*, (cf. *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* *5:142:8), has been reduced to *-ānni*. However, it is more likely that the forms are 3ms; see above, pp. 231f.

cf. *ibid.*:21f.; 5:181:8; *Syl*8:252:18 (but note, e.g., *šumma* ...*PN* *u mārūšu i-tu-r[u]-ni* 3:114:18f.); *PN*₁...*u PN*₂ *ahūšu u mārūšunu ip-šur-ni* 7 "PN₁..., his brother PN₂, and their sons released" 5:263a:3ff. (but note *PN* *u FN aššatšu ip-šuru-ni* 7²⁷⁵). Why the pl. ventive allomorph was deemed sufficient indication of the pl. in these few examples is not clear.

One use of the ventive is to mark the 1s dat.: e.g., *ta-aš-pu-ra* "you sent to me" 3:4:10.²⁷⁶ This function is often usurped, however, by the attachment of the acc. suffix (-*anni/-vinnī*), which also always includes the ventive morpheme.²⁷⁷ Perhaps we should also include as examples of the ventive as 1s dat. the passages where a substantival dat., referring to the speaker, occurs as well: e.g., *il-tap-ra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardika* "The king my lord has written to me, (i.e.,) to your servant" *3:5:9f.²⁷⁸ But these passages could just as readily be grouped under the closely related use of the ventive to indicate motion to a point opposite the speaker; thus, the last example could also be translated "has sent here to your servant." Other, less ambiguous examples of this second use of the ventive, also with

²⁷⁵Perhaps also *ip-šu-[ru(?)-ni* 7(?) 3:35b:4.

²⁷⁶Other examples are listed above, pp. 199f.

²⁷⁷The 1s acc. and dat. suffixes are discussed above, pp. 196, 199ff.

²⁷⁸Cf. also 5:98:r11',14'.

verbs of motion and sending, imagine the speaker in the presence of the addressee: e.g., *il-la-ku-ṛim-mā ana muhhi bēlīya* [u] *bēl(u)ya i-š[al]-i-la-šu-nu-ti* "They will come (here) to my lord, and my lord will question them (here) *6:3:28f.; *PN mār-šipri ana muhhi ka al-tap-ra* "PN the messenger I have sent (here) to you" *6:12:15f.; *ana muhhi šarri bēlīya i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* "He will take (bring) them (here) to the king my lord" *3:5:15f.²⁷⁹ This same phenomenon explains the normal use of the ventive before the 2ms dat. suffix: *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* "I have sent (here) to you" 5:98:r20'; *šak-na-ak-k[u]* "is established(?) (here) for you" *ibid.*:13.²⁸⁰

The observations made above cover all the occurrences of the ventive found in the letters. But with the exception of *eleppašu ta-la-ka* "(if) his ship comes here" 3:107:11, and possibly *[al]-ta-ad-na-šu* "I have given to him (here?)" 3:83:29, they do not adequately explain any of the ventives in the legal documents. It was suggested above (pp. 234f.), that the apparent ventive on sg. stative verbs might reflect the WS **qatala* conjugation: e.g., *ša-ma-t[al]* 3:52a:16; *šū-um-mu-ta* 3:63b:12; *sa-ka* 3:33a:6. Since these forms are all paralleled in similar contexts by forms without final *-a*, it is difficult to consider them ventives.

Only two sg. prefix conjugation verbs with final *-a*

²⁷⁹On the difficult form *il-la!?-ka* 5:87:13, see n. 245, p. 231.

²⁸⁰Note that in *li-iš-la-mu-ki* 5:148:9, the (probably) dat. 2fs pronoun is not attached to the ventive. On this form, see above, n. 251, pp. 232f.

occur in the legal texts; and both are paralleled by verbs without -a in similar contexts: compare *u il-tāk-na-aš-šu ina maryannī* "He (the king) placed him among the *maryannu*" 3:140:5f., and *u il-ta-kān^{an}-šu ina mūde šarri* "He (the king) placed him among the royal councillors" 3:134:11f. The other example is *[i-tu]-ur-ra*²⁸¹ "(if PN) returns" 5:180:13; but note *i-tu-ur* "(if PN₂) returns" in *ibid.*:8. Similar parallels can be found with several pl. verbs; note: *1 bilta kaspi ū-ma-lu-ni* "they will pay 1 talent of silver" *Syl*8:252:19,²⁸² but *1 bilta kaspi ū-ma-lu-ū* *ibid.*:23; *pilka ...up-pā-lu-ⁿⁱ* "they will be responsible for the feudal service..." 3:120:10ff., but *pilka...[u]p-pā-lu* 3:145:34f.; *PN u FN aššatšu il-te-qu-ni X eqla* "PN and his wife FN have taken X field" 5:9:3f., but *FN₁ u FN₁ u FN₂ mārūsa il-te-qu-ū eqla ša PN₂* "FN₁ and her children PN₁ and FN₂ have taken the field of PN₂" 3:159b:4ff.²⁸³

In other instances, verbs which occur frequently in the sg., always without the ventive ending, have it the one or two times they are pl.: e.g., *it-ta-ši* "he has taken (up)" 3:48a:4, and p., but *it-ta-šu-ni* 3:61:6;²⁸⁴ *ip-šur* "he re-

²⁸¹Unless *ur-ra* [šēra] is to be read; see below, p. 348, n. 642.

²⁸²Cf. also *ū-ma-al-lu-ni* in 3:37a:8 (and l.16, where it is sg.; see below, pp. 311f., on agreement).

²⁸³Note also *u sa-ku-ni* *ištu muhhi PN* "they are free (of claims) from PN" 3:54a:9f., and *sa-ku mārū GN(?)* *ištu muhhi* [5:182:5'f. Also, in a letter, *lu-ū sa-ku-ū* *5:142:30.

²⁸⁴This is the only pl. example of this verb.

leased" 5:179:4; 5:263b:4; 5:264:4; etc., but *ip-šur-ni*₇ 5:8:5; *ip-šur-ni*₇²⁸⁵ 5:263a:5. Note also that the frequent sg. forms of *mullû*,²⁸⁶ (*w*)*abaṭu*,²⁸⁷ and *leqû*,²⁸⁸ pl. forms of which were given above, are always non-ventive.²⁸⁹ Corresponding to pl. *i-tû-ur-ni*²⁸⁵ 5:10:17,22, is sg. *i-tû-ur*, *ibid.*:26.²⁹⁰ The other verbs with the ventive suffix do not occur elsewhere in U: *it-ta-za-mu-ni*₇²⁹¹ "they (must not) complain" 3:66a:8; *['i'](?) -za-i-su-ni*₇²⁹¹ "they divided" *ibid.*:14; *la i-šur-ni*₇ "they do not have" (glossing NU.TUK) 3:102:15.²⁹²

In none of these examples from the legal texts is the notion of "motion toward (a point opposite) the speaker" appropriate for the occurrence of the ventive. In fact, the occurrence, in so many cases, of parallel passages without ventives, seems to render it meaningless in those texts where it does appear. It is possible that some scribes felt

²⁸⁵On the absence of -û, see above, pp. 237f.

²⁸⁶E.g., 5:176b:7; 5:180:10,16.

²⁸⁷E.g., 3:126:25; 3:155a:13; 6:29:30; 6:32a:12; and often.

²⁸⁸E.g., 3:130a:3, and p.

²⁸⁹With the exception of the above-mentioned *i-le-qa-aš-šur-nu-ti* in a letter, *3:5:16.

²⁹⁰However, *[i-tu]-ur-ra* does occur once; see above.

²⁹¹On these forms, see below, pp. 246f.

²⁹²Note, later in the text: *la i-šur* (1.19), with pl. subject.

-*ūni* to be the mark of the pl., especially in texts where all pl. verbs are so marked, such as 5:9f. and 3:66a. But this is only sometimes the case, while other texts, such as 3:61f. and 3:113f., have both ventive and non-ventive pl. verbs. Nor does it seem likely that the ventive allomorphs correspond to WS morphs, for the sg. verbs in question are not volitive (i.e., WS *-a), and most of the pl. verbs are not "imperfects" (i.e., -*ni* for WS *-na on plurals²⁹³). Perhaps, in the case of the pl. verbs at least, the scribes considered -*ū* and -*ūni* simply to be variant markers of plurality. Otherwise, I can find no explanation for these peculiar examples of the ventive. Nor is there any obvious reason for the disparity between the letters and the legal texts in the use of the ventive.²⁹⁴

c. The Subjunctive.

There is only one certain subjunctive form in the entire U corpus:²⁹⁵ *mīnum-mē maršētišu...ša ir-šu-ū* "whatever

²⁹³Vs. J. Aro, *AfO* 18, 144.

²⁹⁴Cf. also, in an economic text: *ir-te-ha* 6:104f.:p. Here too the ventive seems to serve no purpose. Could it be the 3ms marker of the WS perfect (*qatala*)? Cf. A.F. Rainey, *UF* 5, 235ff., especially 255ff.

²⁹⁵In 3:170b:8', *ša-a ta-al-ta-qu-mē*, the verb is probably 2mp, with (WS?) -*ū* rather than normal Akk. -*ā* (see above, pp. 229f., and n. 238); in *ibid.*:13', *ša-a ū-ze-ku-ū*, the verb is probably 3mp. For 5:81:15, P.-R. Berger (*UF* 2, 286) proposes [a]p, -*qē*, -*du-šu* "(das) ich ihm anvertraute." However, the reading is too uncertain to be included. (I fail to find any trace of the AB in the copy.) In *6:3:27, the verb should likely be sg.: *šumma [man]um-ma(?) ū-šām-ra-šū-šu-nu-ti* "if anyone(?) causes them trouble." Since pl. verbs with sg. subjects are very rare in U (see below, 313),

property of hers(!)...which she acquired" 3:110a:11ff. For verbs in other subordinate (including relative) clauses, see below, pp. 332ff.

d. The Derived Conjugations.

It should be noted at this point that a few G verbs exhibit the wrong thematic vowel: *i-ra-ṣa-ap* "he will repair" 3:112b:9, usually *i*-class (cf. *ti-ir-ta-ṣi-ip* 3:137:9);²⁹⁶ *ir-ta-ku-us* "he has bound" 3:55:5 (*a/u*-class), perhaps influenced by *ir-ku-uš-šu* in the next line; *ti-ir-hu-uṣ* : *ti-tar-h[u-uṣ]*²⁹⁷ "she will run out(?) 5:6:10", in this meaning usually *i*-class.²⁹⁸ Some verbs occur with different vowels in different texts; note: *i-qar-ru-ub* "may not approach" 5:15:13', and *i-qar-ru-bu* 5:5:5', but *i-qar-ri-ib*

perhaps the verb here is subjunctive after *šumma* (cf. a similar situation in K, above, pp. 62f.); however, no subjunctive appears after *ša* in the previous clause: *mannum-mē ša ...e-ep-pa-aš* "whoever exercises..." 11.25f.

²⁹⁶AHW, 959b; another example probably occurs in a text from Boghazkoy (KUB 3:67:5), cited *ibid.* (*raṣāpu* G 1).

²⁹⁷Nougayrol's explanation (his n. 2) of this peculiar form as a Gt dur. with metathesis (*tirtahhuṣ+titarrhuṣ*) is not convincing. However, no other solution presents itself, except possibly to read *tittir-h[u-uṣ]*; but it seems unlikely that one form would be glossed by the same form with a different spelling.

²⁹⁸Cf. AHw, 942f. (*raḥāṣu* I G A; this reference under 3 b "laufen"). Nougayrol (his n. 2) takes the verb from *raḥāṣu* II "to trust in, rely on," but the notion of movement makes more sense; cf. the parallels with *paṭāru* Syl8:249:23; Sy28:174:12; 3:60b:15; *aṣū* 5:177:10. As Nougayrol also notes, a dur. is expected here; see below, pp. 345ff. Another instance of the wrong vowel may be *li-iš-la-mu-ki*, if from *salāmu* (*i*); see above, n. 251, pp. 232f.

3:86:10; Syl8:254:seal, 1.2;²⁹⁹ *i-ma-gār* ³⁰⁰ "he would (not) agree" 6:52b:6, but *ta-ma-an-g[ur]* 3:60b:12.³⁰¹ Finally, the form *i-ša-aṭ-ṭū-ru* "they were writing" 3:97:19, shows Ass. vowel harmony (Bab. *iṣaṭṭarū*).

The peculiar doubling of the middle radical in the G perf. of *naṣū* was noted above, 175f. For D verbs with a G prefix, see the remarks on the D, below.

A possible example of a Gt is *it-te-ṣi* 5:177:10. The form must be translated as a future: "he will go out." It will be shown below (pp. 345ff.) that there are numerous instances in U in which the pret. replaces the dur., but only one where the perf. replaces the dur. Thus, *it-te-ṣi* is probably not a G perf., but rather a Gt, either dur. (*itteṣṣi*) or pret. (*itteṣi*).³⁰²

It was noted above (p. 236) that a probable Gtn form is

²⁹⁹According to AHw, 915f., this verb is usually *i*-class, but occurs with *u* in OA, and occasionally in late dialects. The *a* in the second syllable is Ass., vs. Bab. *iqerrib*.

³⁰⁰This remains a more likely reading than A.F. Rainey's proposed *i-[ba]l-qar* (IOS 3, 39).

³⁰¹Nougayrol reads *ta-ma-an-[ni]*, but notes (n. 1) that the scribe may have written *ta-ma-an-g[ur]* for *i-ma-an-gur*. In the text to that point, the king has given FN to PN *ana kallūtīšu* "in marriage to him," forever. Then we have: *šumma urram šēram FN lā ta-ma-an-~~ana~~ ana kallūtī ša PN*. I see no reason to shy away from rendering "if in future FN does not agree to marriage with PN." CAD K, 85b (*kallūtu* 1 d) so takes it as well.

³⁰²For the Gt of (*w*)*aṣū*, with separative force, see CAD A/2, 369f. If the *e*-vowel is related to the phenomenon in forms such as *iq-te-bi*, described above, 181ff., then it is likely the form is a pret., which is formally identical with the G perf.

ha-tā-ad-dī (for expected *hitaddu*), a 3ms stative, meaning "(your servant) rejoiced continuously" 5:98:12. The form *it-ta-za-mu-ni*, "they (may not) complain" 3:66a:8, could be a Gtn pret.; the *a*-class is attested elsewhere for the Gtn of *nazāmu*.³⁰³ Nevertheless, von Soden lists the form as a Dt dur.,³⁰⁴ presumably because the verb is a prohibition, and so a dur. is expected. This gains some support from the shape of the verb in 1.14, which is a D, and yet probably has *i-* as its prefix: *ī(?) -za-i-su-ni*,³⁰⁵ "they divided." However, a dur. is not absolutely necessary in 1.8, since the pret. is used in prohibitions elsewhere in U.³⁰⁶ Thus, the matter must remain unresolved.

The D in these texts poses some interesting problems. First, the only formally unambiguous dur.'s³⁰⁷ are *ū-ba-q[ar]* "(may not) appeal" 6:34b:4, and *ū-nam-mar-šū-nu*³⁰⁸ 3:82:18.

³⁰³*it-ta-na-as-za-am*, an MB example, cited in AHW, 771b.

³⁰⁴AHW, 772a.

³⁰⁵See below, on the D.

³⁰⁶E.g., 3:76a:10; 3:81:32; see below, p. 346.

³⁰⁷I.e., the only examples in which the second *a* of the *uparras* form shows up; there are other possible dur. forms, but only forms in which vowel contraction has obliterated the formal distinction between dur. and pret., e.g., *ū-ma-al-lu-ni*, 3:37a:8 (although even with this verb, the sg. is always *umalli*, even when the dur. is expected; see below, n. 309). In 3:110b:4, read *ū-wa-aš-šer_g* (pret.); cf. W.L. Moran "Syrian Scribe," 150.

³⁰⁸None of the meanings of *nuwwuru/nummuru* seems appropriate to this passage. The text is a legal document; the immediate context is: *šanīta PN zitta* (HA.LA.MEŠ) *šunu ana ekalli ū-še-re-eb u mārīšu ū-nam-mar-šū-nu* "Moreover, PN will

Otherwise, the pret. occurs where the dur. is expected, at least 11 times.³⁰⁹ The examples are discussed below in the section on the use of the tenses (pp. 345ff.). For now, it is interesting to speculate that perhaps these pret. forms represent underlying WS imperfective forms (i.e., **yvqat-til-*).³¹⁰

Secondly, the perf. occurs only once:³¹¹ *uk-tab-bi-it* 3:109a:12. This is peculiar in that, in the G and Š conjugations, the perf. is at least as common as the pret., if not more common.

In 3:34b:5', *i-ma-lu-û* for "they will pay" incorrectly has the G rather than the D prefix. The rest (i.e., the base) of the form could be either G or D. The form *[i] (?) -za-*

deliver their shares to the palace, and ... his sons." Nou-gayrol translates the form in question "il les (y) a fait comparaître"; CAD E, 262a, has "and (thus) gained exemption for his sons." Neither of these renderings has any support. (AHw, 769f., does not list the form under *nawāru* D.) Note that, against these two translations, there is no reason not to translate the verbs in the two clauses as future, or, more likely, as expressing obligation (i.e., "is to deliver ..., etc.").

³⁰⁹*û-qa-al-li-il* Syl8:249f.:19; *û-kab-bi-i[t]* ibid.:25; *û-tu-ma-al-li* ibid.:19; 5:173:15; 5:176:7; 5:180:10,16; *û-ma'-er* 3:83:32; *û-na-ke-er* 3:105:56; *û-na-mi-iš* 3:154:17f.; *û-ra-bi* 3:76a:10; perhaps also *û-ra-qi-ip-šu-nu* 3:125:12.

³¹⁰The vocalization of the Ugaritic D prefix-conjugation is of course presumed to be **yvqattil-*, on the basis of all other WS languages. These pret. forms, if they do reflect Ugaritic forms, provide some evidence for this presumption, at least, in terms of the theme vowel. It is unlikely, however, that we can go further, and conclude that the prefix was **yu-*; see also above, nn. 239, 241, p. 230.

³¹¹In *3:19:19, *ut-te-er-mi* should be emended to *li!-te-er-mi*, since an injunctive form is required: "let him return (my servants to me)."

*i-su-ni*³¹² "they divided" 3:66:14, also probably has a G prefix, but here the base is D (pret.). (Note that D *su*'³ *uzu* generally replaces G *sâsu* in MB,³¹³ although the latter does occur once in U: *i-su-su-û* 5:173:23.) In the same text, L.8, *it-ta-sa-mu-ni*⁷ is perhaps a Dt with an *i*-prefix; but see above, under Gtn.

Finally, there are three D verbs in U that do not occur in the D anywhere else in Akk.: *li-ra-hi-iš-šu* "may he inundate him" 3:76a:9,13;³¹⁴ *û-ra-šî-ip-šu-nu* "he will! repair them" 3:125:12;³¹⁵ *û-te-bu-û* "they (may not) raise (a lawsuit)" 3:70:24.³¹⁶ Note also [û]-*ša-ri-ip* "he burned" 5:87:15; *šarāpu* occurs in the D only rarely.³¹⁷ I can find no reason for the occurrence of these verbs in the D.

The form *ta-ba-*³ 6:74b:1 is probably a WS D (3mp; see

³¹²Nougayrol transliterates *û(?) -sa-i-su-nim*, but in the copy the first sign, though quite damaged, looks more like I: ~~û~~.

³¹³CAD Z, 84a.

³¹⁴Cf. AHW, 943a. For the G, cf. *ti-ir-hu-uš* 5:6:10'.

³¹⁵Cf. AHW, 960a. For the G, cf. *i-ra-ša-ap* 3:112b:9; *ti-ir-ta-šî-ip* 3:137a:9.

³¹⁶Cf. AHW, 1343a. The G does not occur in U; it is found, however in a Khatti text from Ras Shamra: PRU 4:98:29'.

³¹⁷Cf. AHW, 1185a. Another possible example is *û-qa-bi* "(s)he said(?)" 3:157a:19'; AHW, 890a, lists only two other D's of *qabû*. It is equally possible, however, since the text is badly damaged, that *û-ka-bi-[it]* "she honored" was intended; cf. Syl8:250:25; 3:109a:12. There is also *šû-um-mu-ta* "it is transferred" 3:63b:12, instead of the normal G. This verb occurs only in U; see above, 234f. Finally, while the D of *namāšu* is fairly common (cf. AHW, 726b), no difference exists between *û-na-mi-iš* 3:154:18, and *i-na-mu-uš* 3:81:26 (both mean "(may not) advance (a lawsuit)"). For *û(?) -tab-bi-[il]* 5:81:33, see below, p. 256, n. 347.

above, p. 230).

With the possible exception of *it-ta-za-mu-ni*₇ (see above, under Gtn and D), no Dt verbs are attested in U. No Dtn's occur.

In contrast to the D, there are few problems in the Š. Note the following examples:

dur.: *ú-šām-ra-ḡú-šū-nu-ti* "(if someone?) causes them trouble" *6:3:27; pret.: *ú-še-ri-ib* "he took in" 5:173:6,11; perf.: *uš-te-rib* "he took in" 3:64:10, but *uḷ-te-bi-lak-ku* "I have sent to you" 5:98:r20';³¹⁸ imper.: *šub-ši* "present" 3:51:7. For the prec., see above, p. 233.

One Š pret. form occurs where a dur. is expected, as happens frequently in the D: *ša uš-bal-ki-it* "whoever removes(?) (this gift)" 3:84:25.

No Št or Štn forms are found.

The only certain N's are dur.'s of the I-' verbs *amāru* and *nābutu*; the latter always occurs in the N in Akk.³¹⁹

The forms are:

3ms: *in-nam-mar* "he met (with me)" *AnOr48:23:7;
i-na-bi-it (i.e., *innabbīt*) "(if) he flees" 3:37a:7,14; *[in'](?) -na-bi-it* 6:63c:9; 3mp: *i-na-bi-tu₄*
 (i.e., *innabbittū*) "(if) they flee" 3:37b:9; cf.
 the participle *mu-un-na<-ab>-tū-ti* 6:74a:2(Ec.).

³¹⁸For *š+ḷ*, see the phonology section, above, pp. 188f.

The possibility that *na-ap-ṭa-ru* in 3:89a:5 is an N stative was discussed above, pp. 236f. In *6:12a:11ff., the text reads: *šanīta ANŠE ša il-te-qè ištū akanna* "moreover, as to the ass which he took from here." Since no one has been mentioned to whom "he" might refer, and since the 3mp, not 3ms, is used for impersonal subjects (see below, p. 318.), Nougayrol's suggestion, to emend to an N pret., *il-le!-qè*, should be accepted.

e. Weak Verbs.

Most of the weak verbs that occur are typical MB formations. Thus, only a few examples of each type will be listed, and comment will be reserved for peculiar forms.

i. verbs I-'₁₋₂

Examples of G forms are:

dur.: *i-kal-šu* 3:92:14; pret.: *i-hu-us-ša* Syl8:253:14; cf. 3:76a:8; perf.: *e-ta-na-ah* 3:198:16; stative: *a-ni-ih* 3:84:24; 3:141:29.

All attested forms of the irregular verb *alāku* are G;

e.g.:

dur.: *i-la-ak* 3:105:54; *il-la-ka-an-ni*³²⁰ 5:87:29;
ta-la-ka (3fs) 3:107:11; *la-lak* (for *lā allak*, 1s³²¹)
 6:74:4; cf. the participle *la-li-ku* (for *lā ālikū*)

³²⁰On this form, and *il-ṭāk(?)*-ka, probably to be read *il-la!-ka*, in 1.13, see above, pp. 231f.

³²¹Cf. A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 41.

ibid.:9; prec. *lil- [lil] -ku-ni* (3mp) *5:142:28.³²²

On the prefix, in the G, of verbs I-' in general, see the discussion above, pp. 179ff.

The only D forms encountered are the numerous examples of the dur. of *uppulu* (i.e., *uppal(ū)*). This verb has as object either an amount of silver (*kaspu*), or feudal service (*pīlku*, *ilku*, or *unuššu*).³²³ Thus, it seems to mean "to pay" or "to bear responsibility for." Because it is written with the PA sign (*ū-pa-lu* 3:61:15; *up-pa-lu* 3:53b:21) only when the object is *unuššu*, Nougayrol concluded that only with that object was the verb *uppulu*.³²⁴ In all other cases, he transliterated the forms as from *(w)abālu*. He did concede, however, that all of the examples might be of a single verb, but that that would be *(w)abālu*.³²⁵ It does seem more likely that we are dealing in all cases with only one verb; the fact that the only writings with PA occur with *unuššu* is almost certainly fortuitous. But several points argue that the verb in question is *uppulu* rather than *(w)abālu*. First, *(w)abālu* with *kaspu* as object means "to be worth, fetch a price,"³²⁶

³²²Perhaps also perf. *it-tal-[ku(?)]* *5:140:18.

³²³In 3:80:15f., the object is *napṭaru*, the meaning of which is not clear. Nougayrol translates "liberation" (cf. also PRU 3, 223, sub *paṭāru*); AHW, 742a, refers to the OB meaning "Verwahrung" for this passage.

³²⁴PRU 3, 227. Nougayrol is followed by CAD A/2, 165a (*apālu* 6 b) with the object *unuššu*; but the dictionary does not list any of the other references, when the object is *(p)ilku* or *kaspu*, under either *abālu* or *apālu*.

³²⁵PRU 3, 227.

³²⁶CAD A/1, 20b (*abālu* A 5 b 1').

whereas *apālu*, frequently in the G, and rarely in the D, means "to pay (a debt)",³²⁷ the latter is clearly intended in these texts. Secondly, (*w*)*abālu* does not ever connote "responsibility" or "legal obligation," which is what is meant in such phrases as *pīlka ša bīti ā-BAL* "he will bear the responsibility for the feudal service of the estate" in 3:67b:11. Again, *apālu*, usually in the G, can mean this.³²⁸ The fact that these notions are usually expressed by *apālu* in the G, whereas in U the verb would be D, is scarcely a problem, since we have seen (above, p. 247) other instances of the D supplanting the G in U. The final piece of evidence is that the G does occur once, in a context similar to those in the D: *PN kasap hubullī ša bīti i-pu-ul* "PN will³²⁹ pay the silver of the debts of the estate" 3:60b:16f. Thus, in spite of the fact that there are only two examples with *PA*,³³⁰ but four with *BA*³³¹ (most have *b/pal*³³²), the form is probably *uppāl(ū)*.³³³

³²⁷CAD A/2, 156ff. (*apālu* A 1 a, 6 a).

³²⁸CAD A/2, 159ff. (*apālu* A 1 c-f).

³²⁹On the tense, see below, p. 347.

³³⁰3:53b:21; 3:61:15.

³³¹3:120:12'; 3:129:19; 3:145:36; 3:166:r15'.

³³²3:63a:17; 3:67b:11; 3:77:10; 3:78:16; 3:80:16,19; 3:82:21; 3:84:21; 3:85:16; 3:89:17,19; 3:96:17; 3:114:31; 3:126:25; 3:135a:14; 3:146:14; 3:155a:13; 3:162b:7; 6:29:30; 6:32:11,14; 6:33:24.

³³³*BA* for *pā* is not very common elsewhere in U, but it is found; note, e.g., *aš-ta-pā-ak* "I have poured" 3:110b:7.

N forms of *amāru* and *nābutu* were cited above, p. 248.

No Š forms are attested.

ii. verbs I-' 3-5

All fientic forms of the G are third person; some examples:

dur.: *ik-ki-im-šu* 3:62:18; *e-ru-ub-ma* 3:141:21,24;
i-ru-ub 3:105:53,55; *e-ep-pa-aš* *6:3:26;³³⁴ pret.:
i-pu-uš 3:45:6; *e-ru-ub* 3:139:17,20;³³⁵ perf.:
i-te-ru-ub *3:19:11; *i-te-ep-šu* 3:97:15,17;³³⁶
 prec.: *li-ru-bu* *5:142:29; note also the infin.
 forms *e-pē-ši* 5:8:19; *e-pa-še* 6:110a:2(Ec.).

The prefix of third person forms is discussed in detail above, pp. 179ff. Since *i* and *e* are probably not distinguished, only the forms *e-ep-pa-aš* and *e-pa-še* are necessarily Ass.; *i-te-ep-šu* and *i-te-ru-ub* can only be Bab. For *edū*, see below under verbs I-y (section v).

In the Š, only *šūrubu* "to cause to enter, deliver" is found:

dur.: Bab. *ū-še-re-eb* 3:82:17, *ū-še-re-bu* 3:84:23,
 but Ass. *ū-še-ra-ab* 3:107:18; pret.: *ū-še-ri-ib*
 5:173:6,11; perf.: *uš-te-rib* 3:64b:10, *t[u-uš]-te-rib*

³³⁴In 5:183:11', read *i-ba-aš<-ši>* "belongs (lit.: is)," vs. Nougayrol's *i-pā-āš*.

³³⁵Perhaps also *la i-ši-ib* 3:76a:9 (pret. or dur. of *ešēbu*); see above, p. 179, n. 46.

³³⁶Note also the broken writing *it-ep-šu-na-a-ši* 5:88:31.

(3fs) 3:55:19; prec.: Bab. *li-šē-r[i-iḫ-šū]* 5:98:
r7', but Ass. *lu-šē-ri-iḫ-š[ū]* ibid.:r4'.

No D or N forms occur.

iii. *verbs II-*³³⁷

The following are all of the attested forms:

G: dur.: *i-šē-'-er* 3:55:7; [*i*]-*šē-'-er-ša* ibid.:18;
probably also *i-šē-er*³³⁸ ibid.:12; *i-se-er*³³⁸ 3:
75a:8,12; *Sy*28:174:13; pret.: *iš-a-am* 5:8:18;
perf.: *il-te-e* 3:72a:7; prec.: *li-iš-al-šu* 3:84:
28; *li-iš-a-lu-šu-nu-ti* (3mp) *6:3:23; infin.:
ša-a-li 4:294:9.

D: pret.: *ū-ma-'-er* 3:80:32; *tu-ma-er* (3fs) 3:172b:
5'.

For *ta-ba-'* 6:74b:2, probably a WS D (3mp: *taba'ū*),
see above, p. 230.

In two of the examples of *ze'ēru/zēru*, the *'*-sign (*AS*³,
no. 233) is used to indicate the doubled middle *-'*- of the
dur., i.e., *ize''er(ša)*. But in the other three, the *'*-sign
does not appear; if they are dur., it is impossible to de-
termine whether they should be normalized the same as the
above forms, or *izêr*, as in OB. The same ambiguity exists
with *il-te-e* (i.e., *iltê* or *ilte'e*) and *ša-a-li* (i.e., *šāli*
or *ša'āli*). After a consonant, *'* is represented by a broken

³³⁷Cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 74ff.

³³⁸This form could also be pret.; but see below, p. 349,
and n. 645.

writing and extra vowel-sign in *iš-a-am* (i.e., *iš'am*).³³⁹ Between the different vowels in the D examples, one has the 'sign, while the other lacks it (for *(t)uma'er*).

A problematic form is *i-ša-i-la-šu-nu-ti* (if the reading is correct) for *iša'ilaššunūti* *6:3:29, presumably a dur. of *ša'ālu*, 3ms. The form is peculiar in that *ša'ālu* is normally an *a*-class verb, and yet it is *i*-class here. The only similar example is from Byblos in the Amarna corpus: *ti-ša-i-lu* EA89:40.³⁴⁰ Perhaps these forms reflect a WS form with an *i*-vowel (e.g., **ša'ila*³⁴¹). It is also possible that the two forms are in fact D pret.'s with incorrect pre-fixes.³⁴²

³³⁹In **EA47:13, simply by a broken writing: *iš-a-l-šu* for *iš'alšu*. Note that in native MB *ša'āmu* and *ša'ālu* are more often treated as weak verbs (e.g., pret. *ta-ša-a-l*, i.e., *tašāl*) than written with ' or in broken form, contrary to the U examples; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 76f.; idem, *Glossar*, 98 (vs. *GAG* §§24c, 98g).

³⁴⁰Probably also, in the same text, *yi-ša-i-lu* ll.34, 45; but the vowel of the first sign is ambiguous. The final *-u* is the WS imperfective morpheme; cf. Moran, "Byblos," 72. *AHW*, 1151b, lists only two other G-type forms with *i*, both of them Gtn imper.'s: *ši-ta'-il-šu-nu* AT 116:17 (Alalakh, MB level); *ši-ta-i-li-in-ni* ABAW NF 16:16:69 (Bogazkoy).

³⁴¹Cf. Ugaritic *šil* "he asked" UT 18:9,10,12. Note also Hebrew *šə'iltūw* I Samuel 1:20; *šə'əlūnū* Psalm 137:3.

³⁴²The D *šu'u-lu* is only attested in OA; cf. *AHW*, 1152a. On the use of the pret. where the dur. is expected (for *iša'ilaššunūti* is future), see below, pp. 345ff.; the Byblos example is made imperfective by the *-u* (see n. 340, above). Possible *i* prefixes for other D verbs in U are cited above, pp. 246f.; at Byblos, note also *ti-ba-ū-na* "they seek" (*bu'ū*) EA129:29 (cf. 19); *i-wa-ši-ir* "I(!) sent" (*wuššuru*) EA137:8; cf. A.F. Rainey, *UF* 7, 419.

iv. *verbs I-w*

Examples of the G are:

dur.: 3ms: *û-šab* 6:74b:5,6; 6:75f.:p. (both Ec.);
uṣ-ṣṭ 3:114:26; 3fs: *tû-šab* 3:56:23; *tu-uḷ-la-ad*
 5:5:6'; *tu-uṣ-ṣṭ* ibid.:9'; perf.: 3ms: *it-t[a]-bal*
 *6:3:17.³⁴³

In the stative, one example preserves the initial *w*:³⁴⁴
 [w]a-š*i*-ib *5:137:7; others do not, however: *aš-bu* 5:87:22,
 24. In 5:173:26, *a-š*i*-ib*, formally a 3ms stative, is probably a mistake for 1s *ašbāku* (see above, p. 227).

Two peculiar G forms occur in the economic texts:

i-ša- "went out" 6:90a:4; *i-bi-la* "brought" 6:104:3,5,7; 6:112b:2. It is unlikely that the scribe(s) simply wrote *i-* for expected *û-*, since the first form would still be incorrect (Akk. *uṣi*). Perhaps the initial *I*-sign should be read *ya_x*, and the forms interpreted as WS (Ugaritic) "perfects": **yaṣa'a*, **yabila*.³⁴⁵

Of the three D forms attested, one preserves the original *w*: pret.: *û-wa-aš-šer_g* "he released" 3:110b:4; in the

³⁴³Nougayrol proposes to make this form a prec. by restoring [l*i*-]. This is very unlikely, however; see above, p. 232, n. 249.

³⁴⁴Such forms are never found in native MB; cf. Aro, *SMG*, 32

³⁴⁵Cf. Ugaritic *yša* (UT 90:1, p. 184), *ybl* (UT 2101:12, p. 26*). Another possibility, still suggesting that these are WS perfects, is that in the spoken language, initial **ya-* in open syllables had become (**yə-→*)**i-*, as happened much later in Aramaic (Syriac and Talmudic; e.g., *iteb* "he sat"). See also A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 45f., 47.

two other forms, *m* is written;³⁴⁶ both are pret.: *ú-ma-³-er* 3:81:32; *tu-ma-er* (3fs) 3:172b:5'.³⁴⁷

All Š prefix-conjugation forms are of the *e*-type, as in K.³⁴⁸ Two dur. forms are Ass.: *ú-še-bal* 5:98:10; *tu-še-bā-[aḷ]* EA45:28 (vs. Bab. (t)ušēbbe/il³⁴⁹). In 3:125:13', *ú-še-ši-ib-šu-nu* may be dur. or pret.; in the context, the former is more likely.³⁵⁰ The perf. forms attested could be Bab. or Ass.: *uš-te-ṣṭ* 3:169:25; *ul-te-bi-lak-ku* 5:98:r20'; *ul-te-[bīl]* *6:3:42. The sole prec. form is Ass.: *lu-še-bi-la* 5:98:r11', whereas the imper. *šu-bi-la* (bid.: r14'; *3:5:12; *6:12:10) is Bab. (vs. Ass. *šēbila*).

v. verbs I-y

The only attestation of verbs usually called I-y in Akk.³⁵¹ are from *edû* "to know," and the Š of *eššuru* "to proceed." The former occurs only in the G pret., as a "pre-

³⁴⁶Cf GAG §21d. In MB, only *aw/mīlu* is ever written with medial *w*; cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 33, n. 1.

³⁴⁷If *ú(?)-tab-bi-[il]* in 5:81:33 is correctly read, it presumably represents a D perf. of (w)*abālu*, for which CAD A/1, 24a, lists only one other occurrence, meaning "to juggle." Perhaps this is another instance of the D replacing the G (see above, p. 247). But the reading is very uncertain; the first sign looks more like *MIS* than *ū*.

³⁴⁸See above, p. 70, and n. 175, for references.

³⁴⁹GAG §103t.

³⁵⁰The accompanying verb, *uraššipšunu* would also have to be future, one of several instances of the pret. replacing the dur. (see below, pp. 345ff.). For that matter, *ú-še-ši-ib-šu-nu* might also be a pret. with future meaning.

³⁵¹Cf. GAG §103e.

formative stative": *lu-ū i-de*₄ (1s) 5:87f.:36, but [*lu*]-*ū i-de* (3ms) *ibid.*:27; *ū-ul i(?)-[d]e* (3ms) *ibid.*:19; cf. [*lu*]-*ū i-de*₄-*mi* (3ms?) EA45:34.³⁵² The Š form may be dur. or pret. (context broken): *ū-še-šar/šerg* (1s/3ms) EA45:16. If the form is dur., then, like (*t*)*ušebbaš* (above), it is Ass.

vi. verbs II-w

There are relatively few examples of these verbs. In the G, note:

dur.: *a-ma-at* *6:3:11; probably also [*i-tu*]-*ur-ra*³⁵³ 5:180:13; pret.: *i-mu-ut* 5:5:7'; perf.: *id-du-uk-šu-nu-t[i]*³⁵⁴ 3:97:22; stative: *mi-ta-ku* (glossing BA.UG₇) 3:76a:3.

Two examples could formally be either pret. or perf.: *i-du-uk-šu* 3:68:9; *i-tū-ur* 5:10:26 (for *id(d)ūkšu*, *it(t)ūr*). The tense of *i-zu-zu-ū* in 5:173:23 is not certain; it could be dur. *izuzzū*, or pret. or perf. *iz(z)ūzū*.³⁵⁵ Likewise, the form *i-tu-ru-ni*₇, in 3:114:14; 3:170b:12, could also be any of the three tenses.³⁵⁶ In 5:185:2',4', the very unusual

³⁵²Cf. also *la-a te-i-de* in the poorly written *5:146:10.

³⁵³Unless the word *urra* "future" is intended. See below, p. 348, n. 642. Note also *i-tu-ur-[r]a/u* in a broken context in 3:73:21, and the pl. form *i-tu-ir-ru-ni*₇ 6:39:13.

³⁵⁴On the final sign, see above, p. 199, n. 121.

³⁵⁵The extra -*ū* is unusual.

³⁵⁶See below, pp. 348f.

form *i-te-ru* occurs. The surrounding context is unintelligible, and of no help. The *e*-vowel remains problematic.

In the D, the following examples occur:

pret.: $\Gamma i^7(?)$ -za-i-zu-ni₇³⁵⁷ 3:66a:17; prec.: *li-te-ru-ni-in-ni* *5:142:18; and probably *li!(UD)-te-er* *3:19:19; imper.: *t[e-e]r* (ms) *6:12:20; cf. *5:137:7;³⁵⁸ *te-er-ri* (fs) 5:148:r9'.

Note that for all the forms that would differ in Bab. and Ass., the Bab. forms occur: *amât* (Ass. *amûat*³⁵⁹), *liter-rûninni* (Ass. *luta''erûni*³⁶⁰), *têr/terrî* (Ass. *ta''er(î)*³⁶¹).

No Š or N forms occur.

vii. verbs II-y

The only forms of verbs II-y are:

³⁵⁷ On the prefix, and the use of the D as opposed to the G listed above, see pp. 246f.

³⁵⁸ Note the very peculiar forms in *5:145f.:8,27 (see above, p. 165, n. 3): *tê-~~te~~-er(-an-nu)*, presumably for *têma tēr(ranni)* "return news (to me)". Nougayrol reads the second sign as *KUR*, and interprets the group as *tê-mate(?)er(-an-nu)*. Far less plausible is the suggestion of P.-R. Berger (*UF* 2, 290), to read *tê-še-er(-an-nu)*, i.e., **têš-šer(rannu)*, with *têma+tēm+tēn+tēš* before a spirantized *t* (*+θ+š*). A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 5, 28, suggests that both instances be emended to *tê<-ma> tel-er(-an-ni!)*. This suffers from the fact that the scribe knew perfectly well how to make a proper *TE* sign (cf. 1.10), and would be unlikely to make exactly the same two mistakes twice (omitting *-ma*, writing *ŠE* for *TE*).

³⁵⁹ Cf., e.g., *a-mu-at*, listed in Mayer, *UGMa*, 78.

³⁶⁰ Cf., e.g., *lu-ka-il*, *ibid.*, 8.

³⁶¹ Cf., e.g., *ta-e-ra*, *ibid.*

pret.: *i-šī-im* "he decreed" 5:10:3; perf.: *ir-te-eh(?)*
 "it remained" 6:96b:8(Ec.), but ventive(?) *ir-te-ha*³⁶²
 6:104f.:p.(Ec.); note also *ir-te-hi* *3:10:10,21.

Since *-hi* occurs in both of the examples in *3:19, it should probably not be emended to *-eh*. Either the scribe confused *rāhu* with *rehû*, or these are instances of "overhanging" vowels (typically inexplicable).³⁶³ The form *išīm* is both Bab. and Ass.;³⁶⁴ *irtēh(i)* is Bab. (the *e* is due to the *h*³⁶⁵), since Ass. would have *irtāh*.³⁶⁶

viii. verbs third weak

There are of course a great many of these verbs. Some examples:

G: dur.: *i-ra-aš-ši* 5:5:2'; *i-le-eq-qè-šu-nu* 3:109a:
 14; *i-la-aq-qè* 3:145:30; *ti(te_g)-še-em-me* (2ms)
 **EA47:22; *ta-la-q-qè* 3:56:20; pret.: *iš-ši-šu* 3:
 49a:12; *il-qè-šu* 3:92:20,21; perf.: *il-te-e*³⁶⁷
 3:72a:7; *tāq-ta-bi* *5:141:9; *tāq-te-bi* *3:19:5;
il-te-qè 3:49b:20; *il-ta-qè* 3:86:5; prec.: *li-iq-bi*:

³⁶²See above, p. 242, n. 294.

³⁶³Note, e.g., *ū-ta-ri* for *utār* (another hollow verb) in *En. El.* 4:71. This phenomenon is discussed by F.R. Kraus, "Ein altbabylonischer 'i-Modus'?" in M.A. Beek, et al., eds., *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae F.M.Th. de Liagre Böhl Dedicatae* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973), 243ff.

³⁶⁴For Ass., cf. *i-šī-im*, cited in Mayer, *UGMa*, 78.

³⁶⁵GAG §9h. ³⁶⁶Cf. GAG, p. 33*, paradigm 27.

³⁶⁷See above, under verbs II-³.

EA45:33; imper.: *qī-bī-ma* 3:4:2, and *p.*; *le-qē*
 *5:137:8; stative: *na-šī* 5:176b:5; infin.: *le-qē-e*
 5:20:2(Ec.); *la-qe-e* 5:81:12'.³⁶⁸

Gtn: stative: probably *hi-tā-ad-dī* 5:98:12.

D: dur.: *ū-ma-al-lu-ni* 7 3:37a:8, and often; pret.:
ū-sa-(ak-)ki 3:11?b:12, and often; prec.: *li-ši-*
*bu-ki*³⁶⁹ 5:148:10.

Š: imper.: *šub-ši* 3:51:7.

N: pret.: perhaps *il-le!(TE)-qē*³⁷⁰ *6:12:12.

The contrast between forms with *e* and forms with *a* in the G is discussed at length above, pp. 181ff.; there it is suggested that the forms with *a* are perhaps not Assyrianisms, but analogous re-formations within U itself.

It should be noted that Bab. vowel contraction occurs whenever a vocalic suffix is added; thus, in pl. forms: *i-qab-bu-ū* "(if) they say" 3:114:19; *ū-se-ku-ū* "they freed" 3:170b:13'; with subjunctive *-u*: *ša ir-šu-ū* "which she(!) acquired" 3:110a:13; with f. *-at* in the stative: *na-da-at*

³⁶⁸Also *a-na tāl-mi-šu* 6:52:6. The text has *ID-mi-šu*; however, the forms makes no sense after a preposition. *DA* and *ID* are easily confused, and *DA* occurs for *tā* elsewhere in U (e.g., *ha-tā-ad-dī*, 5:98:12). A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 3, 39, suggests that *it-mi-šu* is for *atmīšu* "his pronouncement," and reads the main verb as *i-bal-qar* "he shall not appeal." In view of *ana tummî magāru* twice in K (4:167:18; 6:37:14), however, this is unlikely.

³⁶⁹For *lišēbbūki*, from *šebū*, in the D "to satisfy"; cf. 1229b (*šībūtu* 1 e), 1207 (*šebū* G 3b, D 4). Note the same expression in a text of unclear origin: *ši-[b]u-t[a] S[1]G₅-ta(?) li-ši-b[ū]-ka* 5:131:4'.

³⁷⁰See above, p. 249.

"(the land) is overthrown" 5:87:25; *sa-kat* "is free (of claims)" 3:62b:7; 3:86:22.³⁷¹

The final vowel of III-*a* and III-*u* forms has generally been levelled to *i*.³⁷² Thus, note the perf. *it-ta-mi* "he swore" *3:19:13,³⁷³ for expected *ittama*;³⁷⁴ the Gtn stative *ha-tā-ad-dt* "he rejoices" 5:98:12, for expected *hitaddu*.³⁷⁵ From the verb *sakā*, the stative in most Akk. dialects is usually *saku*, although *saki* is also encountered.³⁷⁶ But in these texts, *saku* is never found;³⁷⁷ instead, *saki* predomi-

³⁷¹Also *sa-kā-at* 3:110a:7; *sa-ka₄-at* 3:56:23. In 3:111:11, we have *ki-i-me-e* [DN] *sa-ki-ti ki-i sa-ki-[] FN*; it is more likely that the normal state of the adjective occurred here (*sak₄[ti]*), than that the predicate state (stative) occurred, without contraction (*saki[at]*).

³⁷²Cf. GAG §105d,f, for parallels.

³⁷³Note also in K: *it-t[a-m]i* 3:8:22; see above, p. 73.

³⁷⁴Cf. AHW, 1317b.

³⁷⁵The final -*u* is expected not because *hadā* is III-*u*, but because the paradigmatic Gtn stative is *pitarrus*.

³⁷⁶CAD Z, 25ff. Both *saku* and *saki* occur in K; see above, p. 73.

³⁷⁷*sa-ku* in 5:182:5' is probably pl. However, note the f. verbal adjective (gen.) *sa-ku-ti* Syl8:253:10; usually, the form is *sak₄ti*, as in 3:57:14; 3:111:11, or *sak₄ti*, as in 3:66a:8; 5:15:r2',10' (all *sa-ka₄-ti*); 3:68:16 (*sa-ka-ti!*). *sak₄ti* is an irregular formation; it is difficult to know if it is based on the predicative *sakāt* (e.g., 3:56:23), or if it represents a Ugaritic lexeme (**šakiw/yati*→**šakāt*; cf. Hebrew m. *dāweh* "sick," f. *dāwāh*, probably from **dawiyu*, **dawiyatu* respectively). The latter alternative is rendered less likely by the fact that **škw/y* does not appear in any Ugaritic texts as yet. Moreover, a Ugaritic parallel to the expression in question (*kīma* ^{DUTU}*-ši sak₄ti saki PN*) uses a different root entirely; the Ugaritic text is UT 1005, p. 216, cited below, p. 266, n. 395.

nates.³⁷⁸ However, there are also several examples of *zakā*. It was suggested above, p. 235, that the *a* might represent WS **qatala*, rather than the ventive.

5. Prepositions

a. Simple Prepositions.

adi "until, up to": (always *a-di*) attested only in *adi dā-rīti*, etc.; see below, pp. 279f.

ana "to, for": unless contracted (see below), always *a-na*; used in general as in normal Akk.: e.g., dative: *u iddin-šu ana FN* "and he gave it to FN" 3:53:7f., and p.; motion toward something (Latin *ad*): *u itūr ana bīt abīšu* "he will return to his father's house" 3:81:29f. (in this use, often replaced by *ana muhhi*; see below); with an infinitive: e.g., *ana ša'āli šulmi ša šarri* "to inquire after the king's welfare" 4:294:9f.; *ana epāše* "for building" 6:110a:2(Ec.); "concerning": e.g., *ana eqlētīšunu* "concerning their fields" 3:114:15; etc. As a shortened proclitic, with *n* assimilated, note *am-mi-ni-im-ma* (for *ana mīnim-ma*) "for what?, why?" EA 45:15 (see under section 6, below, s.v.); *as-sū-ri-im* (for *ana surrim*³⁷⁹) "perhaps" EA45:30 (see under section 6, below, s.v.); perhaps also *ak-kā-ši*³⁸⁰ (for *ana kāši*) "to you" *5:

³⁷⁸At least 14 examples, listed above, p. 235, and n. 263.

³⁷⁹AHw, 76a.

³⁸⁰See above, p. 191, n. 95.

137:19.³⁸¹ In **EA47:17, *ša* occurs for no apparent reason in *ana ša yāšē* "to me." *ana* also features in many prepositional and adverbial expressions, for which see below. Occasionally, *ana* occurs where *ina* is expected: e.g., *ana arki šarri [uḷ iḷḷa[k]-ma* "he will not go behind the king" 3:141:19f.; *ittadinšunu ana FN...ana X kaspi* "he gave them to FN...for X silver" 3:61:7ff., vs. *ina X kaspi* e.g., 3:138:5ff., and often (see under *ina*, below); *ana UD.MEŠ(-)TE balāṭ PN* "for (all) the days of PN's life" 3:93b:13, but *ina* in 3:92:13; 3:132:23.³⁸²

arki "after": only with *ana* in 3:141:19f., quoted under *ana*, above; written EGIR-*ki*.

aššum "concerning": e.g., *aš-šum dīni ša PN* "concerning the case of PN" 3:4:9; cf. *5:141:7f. With an infinitive,³⁸³ it means "in order to": *PN iš'am...aš-šum epēši u r[aṣāpi(?)]* *bīta...* "PN bought (a field) in order to rebuild and repair(?) the house..." 5:8f.:17ff.; in an economic text: *100 kaspu aš-šum le-qè-e uqnā* 100 silver for acquiring u.-wool" 5:20:1ff.

³⁸¹Perhaps also *a-da-ri-ti* (*ad-darīti*) "forever" 3:35a:11, unless the text should be emended to *a<-na> da-ri-ti*, since this is the only such example (see below, pp. 279f.).

³⁸²Note also *PN₁ PN₂ ana māx(ūt)īšū i[rkus]* "PN₁ bound PN₂ in adoptive sonship" 3:71a:9f.; cf. 3:55:5f., but *PN₁... i[rkus] PN₂ ina ahūtīšū* 3:75a:4ff. No preposition, but rather an adverbial acc., is used in 3:55:6; see below, pp. 363f.

³⁸³On the construction of the infinitive, see below, pp. 359ff.

biri "between among": normally in Akk. this occurs after *ina*,³⁸⁴ as in *yānu rabū yānu ʒehru* [i-na bi-ri-šu-nu] "There is neither older nor younger between them" 5:173:5; cf. also *i-na be-ri 3 mārī[šu]* "among his 3 sons" 5:12:r5'. However, it also occurs alone, in the same text as the first example: *gabbi ša ibašši bi-ri FN u bi-ri PN isūzū* "They divided everything between FN and PN" 5:173:21ff. In another passage, it occurs both alone and with *ana*,³⁸⁵ in the same clause: *u bīt(u)ya u eqlētūya gabba mimmūya ana bi-ri PN₁ bi-ri PN₂* "My estate, my fields, all my property (is divided) between PN₁ and PN₂" 5:11:6ff.³⁸⁶

eli "over, against": always written UGU.³⁸⁷ It occurs most often in non-verbal clauses of the type *X kaspu eīlīšu* "X silver is against him," i.e., "he owes X silver,"³⁸⁸ as in 5:11:12; etc. Otherwise, note: *akil narkabti lā uma'ʿer eli PN u eli mārīšu* "The overseer of the chariotry may have no power over him" 3:81:31ff.; cf. 3:135a:15f.; *kunuk šarri*

³⁸⁴AHw, 128a.

³⁸⁵*ana biri* is quite rare in Akk.; cf. AHw, 128a (*bīri* 5a). Perhaps this is another instance of *ana* replacing *ina*; see above, under *ana*.

³⁸⁶Note also *be-ri-šu-nu* Sy28:174:8

³⁸⁷Unless Thureau-Dangin is correct in taking *le-li-ia* in 3:111:11 to be the preposition plus a 1s suffix (Sy 18, 253). With *sakū*, this would mean "with regard to me" (see below). In context, this is as plausible as Nougayrol's [f]e-li-ia-[wa], the FN who has been set free in this text.

³⁸⁸Cf. AHw, 201b (*eli* B 2).

eli tuppi "The royal seal is on the tablet" 3:101:heading. Rarely, *eli* means "with regard to":³⁸⁹ *saki PN eli bīt abīšu u eli ahhīšu* "PN is free (of claims) with regard to his father's estate and his brothers" 3:57:15f. In an economic text, *eli* occurs with *nadānu*: 46 kur še'i ša nadīn PN *eli GN* "46 kor of grain which PN gave to(?) GN" 6:92a:9ff.

ina: exhibits its normal range of meanings in U: e.g., locative: *eqlēt PN ša ina*³⁹⁰ *eqel GN* 3:119:5,9, and often; temporal: *ina ūmī(ti?) balāṭīšu* "for (all) the days of his life" 3:92:13;³⁹¹ instrumental: e.g., *u PN GN iraṣṣap ina kaspišu ina erīšu ina gabbi mimmīšu* "PN will repair GN with his own silver, copper (and) property" 3:112b:8ff. *ina* is also used to express exchange (or price), like *kīmū* (q.v.): e.g., *PN...ittadin X eqli...ina Y kaspi* "PN...gave X field... for Y silver" 3:138b:4ff.; cf. 5:9:3ff.; 3:37b:1ff.; etc. The use of *ina* for the ablative, which is common in normal Akk.,³⁹² is sharply curtailed in U; normally, *ištu* (q.v.) replaces it. However, note, e.g., *u šarru uzakki PN ina pilki* "The king freed PN from feudal service" 3:112f.:12f.³⁹³ It was noted above that *ana* (q.v.) occasionally replaces an

³⁸⁹Cf. *AHw*, 201b (*eli* B 5).

³⁹⁰Always written *i-na*.

³⁹¹Cf. also 3:132:23; but with *ana* in 3:93b:11. This idiom is discussed below, p. 305, n. 502.

³⁹²*GAG* §114c; cf. *AHw*, 380b (*ina* B II 1).

³⁹³Compare *uzakkišu šarru...ištu šipri...* 3:68:14f.

expected *ina*. *ina* also occurs in several prepositional and adverbial expressions (see below).

ištu, *ultu*: the latter is rare in U; occasionally both appear in the same text, e.g., 3:62:5,8. As in K, (above, pp. 76f.), this preposition has both its normal Akk. meanings and the nuances of some other prepositions, especially *ina*. Thus, as in regular Akk., it means "out of, away from" locally, as in *ištu bītīša l[ā] uṣṣi* "does not wish to leave her house" 3:55:17; temporally, as in *ištu ūmi annīm* "from this day" p. It usually replaces *ina* with *zakū*:³⁹⁴ e.g., *saki PN ištu pilki* "PN is free of feudal service" 3:46:11f., and p.; also in *ištu libbi mārī PN ištu ahhīšu ša PN₂* "among PN₁'s sons, PN₂'s brothers" 3:102:13f. It replaces either *ina* or *itti* with *leqū*:³⁹⁵ e.g., *ilteqūni X eqla...* *ištu PN* "took X field...from PN" 5:9:4ff., and p. (usually

³⁹⁴With *ina*, cf. 3:112f.:12f., quoted above (*ina*); also, see above, p. 77, and n. 196 there. Cf. also the next note.

³⁹⁵See, e.g., CAD L, 138ff.; AHw, 380b (*ina* B II lb); 544b (*leqū* G 2b). These uses of *ištu* rather than *ina* are probably related in some way to the fact that in Ugaritic the preposition *b* covers the ranges of both *ištu* and *ina*; cf. UT §10.1, pp. 92f., where Gordon notes this as well. Nevertheless, the consistency in the use of *ištu* (*qāti*) with *leqū*, but never for *ina* when the sense is locative or dative, is troublesome. A Ugaritic text, which contains parallels to two frequent clauses where *ištu* is used for *ina* in U Akk., is probably a translation from the Akk.; one is: *km . špš / dbrt . kmt . / br . PN / bunθ . ḏ ḏlm* "Like DN who is pure, likewise PN is free (lit.: pure) of feudal service forever" UT 1005:2ff., p. 216; cf. 3:46:11f., just cited above. The other is: *wmnkm . lyqh / spr . mlk . hnd / byd . PN / ḏ ḏlm* "And no one may take this royal document from PN forever" *ibid.*:12ff.; cf. *mamman lā ilaqqe nidnūti annūti ištu qāti PN...adi dārīti* 3:145:30ff.

ištu qāti; see below). See also the prepositional and adverbial expressions listed below.

ittī "with": usually *it-ti* ; e.g., *PN...dīna itti PN₂...*
iṣṣabat "PN₁...started a legal case with PN₂..." 3:71b:5,
 and often, involving lawsuits "with" or "against" someone
 (cf. also with *namāṣu* 3:81:26f.); with *nakāru*: *nakir PN*
ittī šarri "PN was at war with the king" 3:68:7f.; cf. EA45:
 21; etc. In one instance, *ittī* means "including": *amīlu*
šanū...lā summuḥ ina eqli annī itti FN u itti mārīsa "No one
 else...may have a share in this field, including FN and her
 children" 3:114:26ff. In 5:148, the preposition is written
it-tu (11.14,15,r7').³⁹⁶

kī (once *kī ša*³⁹⁷): used only in adverbial expressions:³⁹⁸
 with the gen.: *kī-i damqi*(SIG₅-*qī*) *kī-i ṭābi*(DU₁₀.GA) "pro-
 perly (and) politely" *3:5:27; with the terminative-adverbial:
kī-i ša ṭābiš(DU₁₀.GA-*iš*) 5:98:r5'; cf. also *kī-i* SIG₅.GA
ibid.:r7'.

kīma "like, as": almost always in the expression *kī-ma DN*
sakīti zaki "he is pure (i.e., free of claims) like pure DN,"
 or, "...as pure as..." 3:57:14f., and often. Once, it is

³⁹⁶CAD I/J, 302, notes that *ittu(m)* occurs in OAk and OB; in 1.14, where [i]t-tu must mean "with me," perhaps we should read *it-tu<-ia>*.

³⁹⁷Cf. CAD K, 324f. (*kī*, prep., c).

³⁹⁸Cf. CAD K, 324b (*kī*, prep., b).

used like *kīmū* (q.v.): *[bē]ta ki-ma [biti]* "house (in exchange) for house" 3:164b:9.

kīmē: only once, in place of *kīma*: *ki-i-me-e* [DN] *zakīti* 3:111:10.

kīmū "in exchange for": e.g., *u iddinšu ana PN ki-i-mu-ū eqlīšu* "and gave it to PN in exchange for his field" 3:46:9f.; cf. 3:62:6; 3:151a:10. Once it is used where *ina* normally occurs: *maškana...ana PN iddinšu ki-mu 800 kaspi* "He gave the lot...to PN for 800 silver" 3:103:15f.; cf. *ina 400 kaspi iddin* *ibid.*:18f.

qadu "together with": written *qa-du*, *qa-dū*, or *qa-du₄*, and occurring only in descriptions of property in legal transactions: e.g., *eqel : hu-li³⁹⁹ qadu dimtīšu qadu serdīšu...* "the field of h., together with its tower, its olive-trees, etc." 3:143ff.:4f., and *p.*; and *p.* in many texts.

b. Compound Prepositions.⁴⁰⁰

With the exception of *ina libbi*, all of these govern only nouns or pronouns referring to persons; this may be fortuitous. The forms are listed alphabetically, first by the noun, then by the preposition.

biri: for *ana biri* and *ina biri*, see above, under *biri* alone.

³⁹⁹On this form, see C. Kühne, *UF* 6, 166f.

⁴⁰⁰A definition is given in the K section, above, p. 79.

lētu: does not occur in prepositional expressions.

libbu: *ana libbi*: only in *ana libbišū tārū* "to go back on one's decision, change one's mind," e.g., *šumma...PN u mārūšū itūrūni ana libbišūnu ana eqlētīšūnu* "if...PN and his sons go back on their intention concerning their fields" 3:114:13ff.; cf. 5:9f.:15ff.; 5:179f.:7ff.; etc.

ina libbi:⁴⁰¹ roughly equivalent to the locative use of *ina*, used especially before GN's; e.g., *tuppāti sar-rūti ina libbi GN išaṭṭurū* "they were writing false tablets in (the midst of) GN" 3:97:17ff.

ištu libbi:⁴⁰² "among," equivalent to *ištu* with the same meaning in *mamman ištu libbi mārt PN₁ ištu ahhīšu ša PN₂* "no one among PN₁'s sons, among PN₂'s brothers" 3:102:12ff.

māru: does not occur in any prepositional expressions.

muhhu: *ana muhhi*:⁴⁰³ equivalent to *ana* in its allative use, i.e., especially with verbs of motion, e.g., *šapāru* (*3:5:9f.; 5:98:rl2'; etc.); *qerēbu* (5:10:rl2'); etc. Often clauses with *ana* plus a noun are paralleled by others with *ana muhhi* plus a pronoun:⁴⁰⁴ *mamma ana PN lā iraggum* "No

⁴⁰¹Cf. GAG §115d; Aro, *SMbG*, 103.

⁴⁰²Cf. GAG §115d; Aro, *SMbG*, 104.

⁴⁰³This is a MB/MA idiom; cf. GAG §115h; Aro, *SMbG*, 105f.; Mayer, *UGma* B6.2.c.b', p. 100.

⁴⁰⁴Cf. CAD M/2, 175 (*muhhu* 2 c).

one may contest against PN" 3:70:10ff., but *mamman ana muhhtšu lā iraggum* "...against him" 3:169:18 (but *ana muhhi amṭli* 3:54a:14f.).

ina muhhi: not attested.

ištu muhhi: used with *sakū* as a synonym for *ištu* (q.v.); in the same text, note: *saki amṭlu ištu amṭli* "Each is free (of claims) from the other" 3:82:19, but *saki PN₁ ištu muhhi PN₂ ahtšu ll.12f.* *ištu* is much more common than *ištu muhhi* in this expression.⁴⁰⁵

panū: *ana panṭ*⁴⁰⁶ "before, in the presence of": p. in legal texts, referring to persons witnessing the transaction: e.g., *ištu ūmi annīm ana panṭ RN/šībūti PN...ipšur* "From this day, before RN/witnesses, PN...released..." 3:127:1ff.; 5:8:1ff. Other examples are: *u bēl(u)ya ana panṭ šarri bēltya liqbi* "May my lord speak in the presence of the king my lord" 5:98:r8'f.; *u bēl(u)ya PN...ana panṭ šarrtšu qarr[ib]šu* "My lord, present PN...to his king" *3:5:26ff.

ina panṭ: not attested.⁴⁰⁷

ištu panṭ "from": rarely, with *leqū*: *u PN ultu panṭ šarri tuppa ilteqe* "PN received a tablet from the king" 3:49:19f.; cf. 3:59b:r11'f.

⁴⁰⁵Other occurrences of *ištu muhhi*, all with *sakū*, are 3:54a:10,12; 3:62:7,9; 3:102:20. Note also *ištu muhhtya* **EA46:11.

⁴⁰⁶Cf. GAG §115 1; Aro, *SMbG*, 107f.

⁴⁰⁷*ina panṭ* is also not listed for MB in Aro, *SMbG*, 107f.

qātu: ana qāti: as a substitute for *ana*, especially with *nadānu*,⁴⁰⁸ when the object of the verb is *kaspu*, and the object of the phrase is a PN (i.e., not *šarru*): *u PN 20 kaspā ana qāti FN...ittadin* "PN gave 20 silver to FN..." 5:15:r4'ff.; 1000 *kaspā inaddin ana qāti PN u qāti mārēšu* 3:75:14f.; cf. also 3:55:9f.; 3:106:11ff. Contrast the following clauses: *u iddinšu ana PN arđēšu 1500 kaspā ana šarri iddin...2000 1000 hurāša ana qāti PN iddin* "...and gave it (estate and fields) to PN his servant. He (PN) gave 1500 silver to the king...(whoever starts legal proceedings) will give 2000 silver (and) 1000 gold to PN" 3:92:7ff. Presumably, these clauses indicate that *ana qāti* was not completely idiomatic; one cannot physically hand over an estate (but see *ištu qāti*, below); nor did one normally give money directly to (into the hand of) the king, but rather to an official. (Nevertheless, *ina qāti šarri*, and occasionally *ana qāti šarri*, do occur with *mullû*; see below.) But money obviously would be passed "hand to hand" from one citizen to another. Perhaps *ana qāti* should be translated "directly to." Once, *ana qāti*, probably a mistake for *ina qāti* (q.v.), denotes agency: *imēra šāšu ana qāti FN...t[ē]r* "Return that ass with PN..." *6:12:17ff.

ina qāti: like *ana qāti*, used for the dative, especially with *mullû* (but not usually with *nadānu*⁴⁰⁹): e.g.,

⁴⁰⁸Also with *mullû* (see below); in 3:38b:3f., with the unintelligible *𒌦*-*šuk(?)*-*li-im*, for which Nougayrol suggests *ū(?)*-*šat_x(?)*-*li-im* "a remis."

⁴⁰⁹Note, however, *ina qāti abīšu tittadin* 6:25:14f.

100 kasper umalli i[n]a qāti ahhtšu "He will pay 100 silver to his brothers" 5:176f.:7f.; cf. 6:40:15f.; but note also X kasper luma[lli] ana qāti PN 5:7:5'. Unlike ana qāti nadānu, ina qāti mullū may occur with šarru, as in 3:37a:7f., 16f.; 6:50:17f.; 6:53:r7'f.⁴¹⁰ (but ...umallūni ana šarri 6:52a:r5'f.). ina qāti is also used once with uppu, with the same force, in 3:162b:7f. (but, again, uppu ana in 3:80:19.) In a nominal clause, note: eqlēt GN₁...ša ina qāti amīli GN₂ "the fields of GN₁..., which belong to the men of GN₂" 3:91a:8'ff., cf. 6',7',11'. But in economic texts, where it is frequent, ina qāti seems to mean "owed by" (equivalent to eli?): e.g., 3:194f.:p. Finally, it rarely denotes agency:⁴¹¹ u 2 sisī damqāti...luššēbīla ana ardīka ina qāti PN... "that he send your servant...2 fine horses with PN" 5:98:r9'ff., cf. r13'ff. (but replaced by ana qāti in *6:12:17, quoted above).

ištu qāti "from": especially in the extremely frequent mamma(n) lā ila/eqqēšu(nu) ištu qāti PN⁴¹² "No one may take it/them from PN," usually referring to real estate, unlike ana/ina qāti, e.g., 3:60b:18f., and p. Very rarely, ištu alone occurs, e.g., in 3:146a:6ff. In a very few instances, ištu qāti is also used with sakū, exactly like ištu muhhi (q.v.), e.g., 3:84:22f.; 3:86:17f.

⁴¹⁰Probably also 5:180:10f.,15f.

⁴¹¹Cf. AHW, 911a (qātu E 1).

⁴¹²For a Ugaritic parallel, see above, p. 266, n. 395.

6. Adverbs

a. The following are the simple adverbs attested in U:

adīni "until now, as yet": probably in [a-dī-ni ul
ikšūdanni "they have still not reached me" 5:87:24.

akanna A "thus, as follows": e.g., *a-kân-na iqabbû* "(if)
they say as follows" 3:114:19, and often. Note the WPA
variant in a probable U text from Amarna: *kân-na-am-m[a]*
**EA46:5'. In EA45:13, read probably [a-k]ân^{an}-na-am (W.L.
Moran).

akanna B "here": only in *imēru ša illeqe! ultu a-kân-na*
"the ass which was taken from here" *6:12a:11ff. *akanna*
with this meaning is not attested elsewhere until NB.⁴¹³

**akkaya* (*5:137:19): see above, p. 191, n. 95.

ammaka "there": [n]āra am-ma-ka ul ibbēr "he will/may not
cross the river there" 3:73a:13; u eqeḷ PN am-ma-ka-[m]a
"and the field of PN there" 3:48:15. Note that *ammaka* is
Ass.⁴¹⁴

am-mīni "why?" (from *ana mīni*): always in broken contexts:
am-mi-ni-im-ma EA45:15; *am-mi-ni-mi* ibid.:23; *am-mi-ni*,
**EA46:7'.

⁴¹³So AHw, 27b. CAD A/1, 260 gives MB *a-ka-nu* once,
but AHw, 28a, lists this separately.

⁴¹⁴CAD A/2, 66f.; the word also occurs at Boghazkoy.

annaka "here": *an-na-ka asû yānu* "There is no physician here" EA49:24f. Like *amma*, this word is Ass.⁴¹⁵

anumma "now, hereby": followed by an injunctive (prec. or imper.) or the perf., rarely by the pret. (see below, p. 343); e.g., *a-nu-um-ma...ulṭēbilakku* "I hereby send to you..." 5: 98:rl7ff., and often. With *inanna*, it always appears second.

anummê: once, instead of *anumma*: Syl8:249:4. The following word, *mīnum-mê*, may have affected the ending of the adverb.⁴¹⁶ Note *anumma* later in the same text, l.14.

appūna "moreover": *ap-pu-na-ma* 3:102:12; cf. 3:52a:11.

appūna(-ma) introduces a new thought; it seems to indicate a less substantial break than *šanīta* (q.v.), however.

arkānašû: only in *šanīta* PN *zaki kīma DN ana dārītti ar-kā-na-šû zaki* "Moreover PN is free (of claims) like DN forever; he is free hereafter(?)" 3:70:17ff. CAD A/2, 273, lists the word with (w)*arkānu* "later on." Both the form and the nuance here are unique, and difficult to explain.

assurrim "heaven forbid":^{416a} only in *šanīta as-sû-ri-im* [šar GN(?)] *ittīya inakkir* "Heaven forbid that the king of GN(?) will make war against me" EA45:30f.

⁴¹⁵This word is also found at Boghazkoy, and in Amarna letters from Byblos and Amurru; see CAD A/2, 126.

⁴¹⁶The same form occurs once in a text written in Amurru, PRU 4:141:5.

^{416a}See the discussion of this word by Moshe Held in JCS 15 (1961), pp. 20f.

ašrānu "there": e.g., *amīli ša aš-ra-nu ittīṭka wjašīb*
 "the men living there with you" *5:137:6f., cf. 19. The
 word is common in OB (Mari and Shemshara) and WPA.⁴¹⁷

atta(?): as Nougayrol notes (PRU 3, 19, n. 2), this cannot
 be the 2ms pronoun: *šanīta itterub at-ta ana bīt ilāni*
 "Moreover he has now(??) entered the temple" *3:19:10ff.
 Nougayrol compares the form, which is unique in Akk. if it
 is an adverb, with Hebrew *attāh* "now." However, that word
 appears in Ugaritic as *ant*,⁴¹⁸ and so the matter must remain
 unresolved.

ayya/ikām-ma: normally vocalized *ay(y)akamma* in the dic-
 tionaries,⁴¹⁹ and found only in OA, the word means "some-
 where, anywhere," the indefinite counterpart of Ass. *ay(y)a-*
*ka(m)*⁴²⁰ "where?". In U it occurs only in *tēma [a(?) -i]a/*
*yē-ka-am-ma*⁴²¹ *šupr[al]nni* "Send me news ..." 5:88:34f. Nou-
 gayrol translates the form "[de quelque] manière(?)"; this
 is undoubtedly the correct direction of interpretation. The
 writer, the king of Ugarit, is desperate, under attack; he
 is seeking support from his ally, the king of Cyprus. It is

⁴¹⁷Cf. CAD A/2, 453f.

⁴¹⁸UT §1888, p. 458.

⁴¹⁹CAD A/1, 224; AHw, 24a; cf. GAG §118b.

⁴²⁰CAD A/1, 232f.; AHw, 24a.

⁴²¹For *IA=yē*, cf. AS³, no. 104. In a text found at
 Ras Shamra, probably written in Khatti, note *a-yē-iš-am-me-e*
 "somewhere" PRU 4:222:28.

much more likely that the adverb in question means "somehow, any way (possible)" here, rather than "somewhere." If so, it is probably not related to the OA *ayyakam-ma*.⁴²²

danniš "greatly, much": normally written *dan-niš*, e.g., 3:4:8(bis), etc.

dāriš "forever": see below, section b.

enūma: possibly, as in K (see above, pp. 141f.), the word has lost its subordinating function, and has become an adverb used to introduce the business of a document: e.g., *bēlī e-nu-ma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardtka mā...* "My lord: now then, the king my lord has written to your servant (saying)..." *3:5:9ff. The evidence is not sufficient to be certain that it is not a conjunction, however. See further below, pp. 338f.^{422a}

inanna "now (then)": occasionally with its originally temporal meaning, as in *šanīta 2 bītāt PN₁ ša [ina] panānu ana PN₂ i-na-an-na šarru ana PN₃ iddinšu* "Moreover the 2 houses of PN₁, which formerly belonged to PN₂, the king has now given to PN₃" 3:103:13f. Often, however, it is more an interjection than an adverb, as noted in CAD I/J, 144a: e.g., *i-na-an-na šumma...elep[ētu]...ibaššī-mi* "Now then, if... ships...are present" 5:88:32ff., and often.

⁴²²Perhaps the word in this case is composed of *ayyū* "which?" plus *kīam* "thus" plus *-ma* (making it indefinite): "in some manner."

^{422a}Cf. also W.L. Moran, *OrNS* 29 (1960), p. 17, n. 1.

ištēn(šu), *ittīlta* "firstly, in the first place": an adverbial acc.; see below, pp. 364f.

kām-ma: see *kām*, below.

kannam(-ma): see *akanna A*, above.

kē "how?": perhaps in *kī-i šaknakk[u]* "How is it established for you?(?) 5:98:13. In 3:111:11, *kē* apparently replaces *kām* (q.v.): *kīmē [DN] šakīti kī-i šakīti(?) FN* "FN is as pure as pure DN."⁴²³

kām "thus": written with a medial glide, i.e., without MB contraction of *ia* to *ā*, in *kī-ia-am EA45:23*, **AnOr48:23:8*; both with *qabū* "...spoke as follows." With *-ma*, contraction has occurred: *u mātu ka-am-ma nadāt* "And in that way the country is overthrown" 5:87:25.⁴²⁴

kīšū-ma "likewise": only in *u kī-šu-ma šunū-ma* "they (will be treated) likewise" 5:10:23, and probably *kī-i-šu-ma ka-* 3:172b:3'. This adverb occurs elsewhere only in the Amarna letters from Byblos.⁴²⁵

⁴²³Perhaps this use of *kīmē*...*kē* should be compared with the Hebrew construction employing *kə*...*kə*: e.g., *kā-mōkā kə-par'ōh* "You are like Pharaoh" Genesis 44:18; cf. Jónson, *GHB* §174i, p. 528. The change of *kīmē* to *kē* remains difficult, however.

⁴²⁴Perhaps also *ka-a-ma* 5:81:14 (broken context); the form is written the same way in a K text, 4:155:19. But here perhaps [DAM].*GĀR-ka-a-ma* "your trader" should be read, as suggested by P.-R. Berger, *UF* 2, 286.

⁴²⁵Cf. *EA* II, 1441; *CAD* K, 465a.

lā (negative): see below, pp. 319ff.

mašna: only in ištu ūmi ann[tm...] PN₁ māx [PN₂...] ittaši
bētšu [...] ma-āš-na bētšu [...] u ittadin[...] 3:109:1ff.

Nougayrol and the dictionaries⁴²⁶ take the word to mean
"secondly." It is probably a Ugaritic word, adverbial acc.;
cf. mōn "repetition" UT 51:1:20, p. 170.⁴²⁷

panānu "formerly": only in 2 bētāt PN₁ ša [ina] pa-na-nu
ana PN₂ "the 2 houses of PN₁ which formerly belonged to PN₂"
3:103:13. Nougayrol's restoration of the preposition is
probably correct; panānu is often preceded by a preposition,
especially in WPA.⁴²⁸ In 5:10:24, Nougayrol has restored
a form panāna(m)-ma in šanīta [pa-na]-na-ma eqlu annū ša PN
abi FN u inanna eqlu itūr ana FN "Moreover this field was
formerly PN the father of FN's, and now the field has re-
turned to FN." This restoration is also quite likely, even
though panāna(m-ma) is not attested elsewhere.

pīqat "perhaps": in ...i]qb[i] pī-qa-at [aballuṭ(?) u(?)]
pī-qa-at amāt "...he said: perhaps I would live(?) and(?)
perhaps I would die" *6:3:10f.

šanām(-ma) and ina šanīšu "secondly, in the second place":
see below, pp. 364f.

⁴²⁶CAD M/1, 381b; AHw, 628b.

⁴²⁷Cf. šanīta, šanām-ma, below, pp. 364f.

⁴²⁸Cf. AHw, 818a; EA II, 1488. For locative-adverbial
-u(m) after ina, cf. GAG §66c.

šanīta "secondly; moreover": originally an adverbial acc. Occasionally, it retains its original meaning "secondly," and is a synonym of *šanām*; see below, pp. 364f. Most often, however, its meaning is weakened to "moreover," and it is frequently used to introduce new paragraphs, p.

šēra(m): see *urra(m)*, below.

ṭābiš "politely, well": only in *kē ša DU₁₀.GA-iš 5:98:r5'*.

ul (negative): see below, pp. 319ff.

umma "thus": indicating direct speech; see below, p. 282.

urra(m): only in the very common *urra(m) šēra(m)*⁴²⁹ "in future."⁴³⁰ The two words are in fact adverbial acc.'s.

urra(m) šēra(m) normally stands first in a clause, although it is preceded by *šanīta*, and usually (but not always) by *šumma*.⁴³¹

b. Expressions for "Forever."

The following combinations are attested:

adi dāri dūri: only in 3:134:7; 5:9:14f.

adi dāriš: only in 3:126:10.⁴³²

⁴²⁹Written in a variety of ways; see above, pp. 187, 207, for examples.

⁴³⁰Cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, *Sy* 18, 252, n. 1; *AHw*, 1219a.

⁴³¹Note the Ugaritic equivalent, or translation, *šḥr almt*, also at the head of the clause, in *UT* 1008:15, p. 217.

⁴³²Note also [*ana/adi d*] *āriš* 3:108:22.

adi dārīt: only in 5:263:13.

*adi dārīt*⁴³³ 3:118:18; 3:120:r5',9'; 3:148a:14,18,
and often.

ana dārī dūri: 3:49:14; 3:53b:19; 3:65b:9,13, and
often.

ana dārīš: only in 3:147a:8.⁴³⁴

*ana dārīt*⁴³³ 3:87:r5',11'; 3:90b:15; 3:96:19,
and often.

*ana dārīt**im*-*ma*: only in 3:48a:9; 3:50a:10,14.

Note also *ad-dārīt* (*a-da-ri-ti*) 3:35a:11, unless *a<-na>* is
to be read; and [*ana dārī*(?) *dārīt*šū 3:100:10.

All of the examples with *adi* occur in texts from the
reign of Ammistamru, or later (i.e., Ibiranu⁴³⁵ or Niqmaddu
III⁴³⁶), or in undated texts.⁴³⁷ Examples with *ana*, however,
occur in all reigns. In some texts, more than one form is
found: e.g., 3:64a:6,11; three different forms occur in 3:
149a:8,9,12.

The expression for "(since) always" is *ultu dārīt* in
3:91:5',9'.

⁴³³Also *dārīt*, usually with *ana*: e.g., 3:70:19; 3:
74b:8; 3:84:19; etc.

⁴³⁴See n. 432, above.

⁴³⁵E.g., 3:167:18.

⁴³⁶E.g., 6:44f.:13,20,25.

⁴³⁷E.g., 5:9:4f.; 5:263:13. A reasonable assumption,
then, is that those undated texts are from the reigns of
those later kings.

7. The Enclitic Particle -mê⁴³⁸

In U, this particle forms the indefinite pronouns *minum-mê* "anything, whatever" and *mannum-mê* "anyone, whoever."⁴³⁹ The preposition *kîmê* occurs only once (3:111:10), replacing *kîma* (see above, pp. 267f.); it is not attested as a conjunction. The only other occurrence of -mê is in *anummê*, which appears once (Syl8:249:4), instead of *anumma*; see above, p. 274, s.v.

Thus, it appears that -mê is less common in U than in K.

8. Markers of Direct Speech

Most quotations are introduced by *mā* (ma-a), usually after the verb *qabû*: e.g., [PN] *ana ahhîšu u [...] akanna iqtēbi mā anumma X kaspu annû šîm(u)ya ša taltaqû-mi* "PN said to his brothers and...as follows: 'Now then, this X silver is my price which you have taken'" 3:170b:4ff.,⁴⁴⁰ once, after *šapāru*: *enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardîka mā 1600 šiltāhî šūbīlam-mi* "Now the king my lord has written to your servant: 'Send 1600 arrows'" *3:5:9ff. Once, the quote follows *qabû* directly, without *mā*: *ištu ūmi annēm RN šar GN akanna iqtabi šumma...* "From this day

⁴³⁸For the spelling, see the examples on pp. 177f.

⁴³⁹Note that *mannum-ma* also occurs (see above, 205ff.). It is interesting to observe, however, that only the form with -mê serves as an independent antecedent of *ša* for the notion of the general relative, or as the general relative pronoun itself.

⁴⁴⁰Cf. also *3:19:5f.; 3:114:20(bis); *5:141:9f.

RN king of GN said: 'If...' 3:76a:1ff.

In three legal texts, a quotation is introduced with the phrase *šanīta umma PN* "moreover, thus PN (said)": 3:80:20ff.; 3:82:22ff.; 3:86:20ff. And, of course, *umma* occurs p. in letter introductions: *ana X qībīl-ma umma Y(-ma)* or *umma Y ana X(-ma) qībīl-ma* "Speak to X; thus (says) Y" e.g., 3:4:1ff.; 5:147:1ff. *umma* is regularly followed by the gen.; see above, p. 219.441

In another text, the only notice of the following quote is the conjunction *u*: *PN...uwaššer FN amatšu...u*⁴⁴² *aštapak šamna ana qaqqadīša...* "PN...released FN his servant ...and: 'I have poured oil on her head...' 3:110b:3ff. Finally, in one text, there is no indication at all of the beginning of direct speech: *FN šarratu GN itti PN₁ mār PN₂ pūhuka šubšī...* "FN, queen of GN, with PN₁, son of PN₂ (spoke): 'Present your exchange...' 3:51b:4ff.

The particle *-mi*, indicating that the clause in which it occurs is a quote, is usually written with *MI* (19 times), but occasionally with *ME* (five times);⁴⁴³ in *3:19, each

⁴⁴¹The fact that *umma* is followed by the gen. in WPA does not mean that it must be understood as an Akkadogram for some WS word that is a noun, such as *tīm*, as suggested by P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1, 218. Rather, it merely indicates that *umma* was construed in the same way as such a WS word. Cf. also the pertinent remarks of A.F. Rainey, *IOS* 5, 22f., n. 25.

⁴⁴²Nougayrol's suggestion (his n. 4), to read this sign as KIMIN, meaning *akanna*, is not convincing.

⁴⁴³On *i* vs. *e*, see above, pp. 177ff.

occurs three times (the other examples are referred to below). The particle is used very inconsistently. In the letters, it appears at least once in each quote: e.g., *3:5:9ff., quoted above; *kī taqtebi l mā...lugammir-mi* "when you wrote me: '...let me finish'" (verbs in intervening clauses broken at end) *5:141f.:9ff.⁴⁴⁴ In legal texts, however *-mi* occurs in only three quotations:⁴⁴⁵ 3:170b:14ff. (quoted above); *šanīta umma PN₁ anummā-mi bīt sisī u...ana PN₂* "Moreover, thus PN₁ (said): 'Now, the stable and...belong to PN₂'" 3:80f.:20ff.; in 3:114:20, *mā* plus a short quote occurs twice, but only in the first does *-mi* appear: (*šumma...iqabbū*) *mā ul bēlni attā-mi mā šarru šanū bēlni* "(if...they say:) 'You are not our lord; another king is our lord'." In six other instances of direct speech, *-mi* does not occur; note, e.g., 3:51b:4ff.; 3:76a:1ff.; 3:110b:3ff., all quoted above, and 3:82:27f.; 3:86:20f.; 5:176b:3ff.⁴⁴⁶ The reasons for the use or non-use of *-mi*, and for the disparity between the letters and the legal texts, are unclear.

The particle also appears several times outside direct speech, in both text types: *PN₁ itti PN₂...pūhata īpuš iššī-mi PN₁...u iddinšu* "PN₁ made an exchange with PN₂...;

⁴⁴⁴Cf. also *3:19:7; *5:112:11',12'; *-mi* occurs five times in EA45 (11.23,24,28,34bis), probably always in direct speech; but the text is too broken to be certain.

⁴⁴⁵Perhaps also 5:15:rl',2'.

⁴⁴⁶In 5:173:26, the text breaks after the verb, and so *-mi* may or may not have appeared.

PN₁ took...and gave it" 3:45f.:3ff.; PN...*ittadin-mi...zakûni* ...*saki...ša dîna iṣabbat-mi...iddin* "PN...gave...; they are free...; (each is) free...; whoever brings suit...will give" 3:54:5ff.; *šumma elepp[ētu] ša nakrē šanāt[i] ibaššē-mi* "if there are other ships of the enemies" 5:88:32ff.; *ittami adi lā iddin-mi*⁴⁴⁷ *ardīka* "he swore, as long as he has not given your servants" *3:19:13f.; *u kaspā ša uṣṣi ištu qātīka anad-din-mi u ardīya ana yāšē litēr!-mi u X kaspaka ša intēhi idin-mi u lā tašakkan hubullam-mi ina berīni ištēn amīlu nīnu* "And I will give (you) the silver that 'leaves your hand.' Only let him return my servants to me. So give the X silver that remains (owing), and do not put interest between us; we are one man" *ibid.* 16ff. This last text (*3:19) also has *-mi* once in a quote (l.7); in the other texts, *-mi* does not otherwise occur. I can find no explanation or meaning for the particle in these examples. Perhaps in some cases it corresponds to the equally obscure Ugaritic enclitic *m*.⁴⁴⁸

9. Assyrian Forms

There are more Assyrianisms in U than were noted for K, but considering the difference in the number of texts under consideration, the proportion of Assyrianisms in U is only slightly greater. Very few of them are the norm for a given feature; rather, they are usually isolated phenomena that

⁴⁴⁷Here in an indirect quote.

⁴⁴⁸Cf. *UT* §11.4-8, pp. 103f.

appear alongside more frequently attested Bab. forms.

(i) The anaphoric/third person independent pronouns *šūt*, *šuwāti*, *šīt* occur six times altogether, while Bab. *šū*, *šāšu* are found eight times.⁴⁴⁹

(ii) The 3mp acc. pronominal suffix is Bab. *-šunūti* eight times, but Ass. *-šunu* many times on *nadānu* and *leqū* throughout the legal texts, in addition to five other instances.⁴⁵⁰ The only attestation of a 2mp acc. suffix is Ass. *-kunu* (*5:146:23).

(iii) The Ass. nominal ending *-uttu*⁴⁵¹ occurs in the following forms: LUGAL-*ut-ta* "kingship" *6:3:25; *qal-lu-ut-ti-ka* "your service(?)" *5:137:5,8; LÚ.MEŠ DAM.GĀR-*ut-ti* "position of merchant" or "merchants" 6:32:10. The f. ending *-itti*⁴⁵¹ occurs in: *a-na da-ri-it-ti* "forever" 3:70:19; 3:84:19. For Bab., note, e.g., *an-nu-ū-ti* 6:45:27; LÚ.MEŠ *mar-ia-nu-ti*⁴⁵² 6:33:23; *ana/adi da-ri-ti*⁴⁵² 3:87:r5'; 6:45:20, and *p*.

(iv) There are several Ass. verb forms; but, again, there are considerably more that are strictly Bab. The following lists all the Assyrianisms that are certain; Bab. forms (not exhaustive) are given in parentheses.

⁴⁴⁹See above, pp. 202ff.

⁴⁵⁰Above, p. 198f.

⁴⁵¹GAG §20d.

⁴⁵²These forms could of course also be Ass., due to the non-indication of doubled consonants, which is especially pervasive in U.

dur.: *i-ša-aṭ-ṭū-ru* 3:97:19 (but *il-la-ku-ni[m-m]a*

*6:3:28; *li-iš-la-mu-ka* 5:148:9; etc.);

e-ep-pa-aš *6:3:26 (but probably *i-ru-ub* 3:107:

8, unless this is pret.; perf. *i-te-ep-šu*

i-te-ru-ub *3:19:11);

ú-še-ra-ab 3:107:13 (but probably *ú-še-re-eb*

3:82:17, unless this is pret.);

ú-še-bal 5:98:10; probably *tu-še-bā-[al]* EA45:

28 (but imper. *šu-bi-la* 5:98:r4'; *3:5:12);

possibly *ú-še-šar* EA45:16 (but equally possibly

pret. *ú-še-šerg*);

prec.: *lu-ú-ma-[al-li]* (3ms) 5:7:5' (but *li-ši-bu-ki*

(3mp) 5:148:10; all other D 3ms/p prec.'s

are Bab.⁴⁵³);

[*lu-še-bi-la* 5:98:r11'; *lu-še-ri-ib-š[u]*

ibid.:r4' (but *li-še-r[i-ib-šu]*

ibid.:r7'; no other Š prec.'s occur);

imper.: *qar-ri-[ib]-šu* *3:5:28 (but *gu₅-mi-ir* *5:142:7);

stative: probably *ta-din* 6:110a:2(Ec.) (but *na-din* 6:

108:3,6(Ec.); 3:68:6(J), and often; all

D statives⁴⁵⁴);

infin.: *e-pa-še* 6:110a:2(Ec.) (but *e-pé-ši* 5:8:19(J)).

(v) Other forms with *e* for expected *i*, or *a* for expected

⁴⁵³*li-ra-hi-iš-šu* 3:76a:9,13; *li-hal-li-iq* 3:105:57;
li-te-ru-ni-in-ni 3:52:18; note also G 1s *lu-ú-uš-ku-un*
 5:140:30.

⁴⁵⁴Unless *sa-ak-ki* 3:110a:5 and *sa-ak-ka!* 3:166:16' are
 Ass. D's.

e, could also be Ass.; other suggestions were put forth above, 179ff., however.

(vi) It is possible that the 3fs prefix, which is normally *t-* in U, is due to Ass. influence; however, WS influence seems equally likely.

(vii) Two adverbs are Ass.: *ammaka*, *annaka*; see above, 273f., s.v.

(viii) The particle *mā*, indicating that direct speech follows, may be Ass. (GAG §121b).

Thus, for the most part, the U dialect exhibits Bab. (particularly MB) forms, although a number of genuine Assyrianisms do appear in the texts.

D. SYNTAX

1. *Word Order*⁴⁵⁵

a. Verbal Clauses.⁴⁵⁶

There is no fixed word order for any type of clause in these texts. In fact, the order of the various parts of speech in the clauses of many texts appears to be quite arbitrary. In quite a number of texts, e.g., the word order changes from one clause to the next, even in clauses with similar grammar otherwise, and similar content. Some examples are: *šumma urram šēram PN ana māti šanīti innabbīt* (Conj.-Ap-S-A-V) "if in future PN flees to another country" 3:37a:5ff., but *šumma urram šēram PN₂ innabbīt ana māti šanīti* (Conj.-Ap-S-V-A) *ibid.*:13ff.; *ša [dīn]a unammīš itti PN₁ u ahišū itti [PN₂] 1 kakkara hurāši [ana] šarri inand[in] u 5 kakkara kas[pī] ana PN₁ ina[n]din] ša dīna una[mmiš]* (S-O-V-A; u-O-A-V-S) "Whoever starts legal action against PN₁ and his brother, against PN₂, will give the king 1 talent of gold; and whoever starts legal action will give PN₁ 5 talents of silver" 3:154:17ff.; *u ipṭuršū ištu aškāpūti u iškunšū ina amīlī imitti u amīl imitti ana pūhṭū ina aškāpūti iškun* (u-V(o)-A; u-V(o)-A; u-O-A-A-V) "And (the king) removed him from the leatherworkers, and placed him among the *imittu*-men,⁴⁵⁷ and he placed an *imittu*-man among the

⁴⁵⁵Cf. GAG §§130,131.

⁴⁵⁶Clauses with the stative are treated in section b.

⁴⁵⁷On this word, written LÚ.ZAG.LU, cf. CAD I/J, 126b (*imittu* E).

leatherworkers as his substitute" 3:78:8ff.; *u PN GN iraṣṣap ina kaspišu ina erīšu ina gabbi mimmišu u šarru uzakki GN ina pilki* (*u-S-O-V-A; u-S-V-O-A*) "And PN will rebuild GN with his own silver, copper, and property. And the king freed GN of feudal service" 3:112b:8ff.; etc.⁴⁵⁸

In addition to changes of word order within individual texts, there are some clauses which appear in several different texts, the order of their constituents differing in some from that in others: e.g., *ištu ūmi annīm RN...ittadin bīta eqla ša PN₁ ana PN₂* (*Ap-S-V-O-A*) "From this day RN... gave the estate and land of PN₁ to PN₂" 3:160b:1ff., and often; but *ištu ūmi annīm RN...bīta u eqlēti ša FN ina GN ana PN ittadinšunu* (*Ap-S-O-A-V(o)*) "From this day RN...gave the estate and lands of FN in GN to PN" 3:89b:1ff. Or compare *amīlu mamman lā ilaqqēšu ištu qāti PN* (*S-lā-V(o)-A*) "No one may take it from PN" 3:109b:13ff., and often, with *mamman ištu qātīšu lā ileqqēšunu* (*S-A-lā-V(o)*) 3:109a:13f.

There are, however, a few patterns and tendencies that emerge from the apparent arbitrariness. Thus, in the let-

⁴⁵⁸Other examples: 3:56:7ff. (*Conj.-Ap-S-V-O; ...; u-Conj.-S-O-V*); 3:114:13ff. (*Conj.-Ap-S-V-A-A; ...u-Conj.-S-A-A-V*); 3:134f.:8ff. (*Ap-A-S-V(o); u-V(o)-A; S-O-A-V; u-S-lā-V-A*). A parade example is 3:102ff., a text concerning several different royal grants to one individual; each grant is treated in a separate paragraph. Note the following selections: *šanīta X šarru iddinšunu ana PN u PN 300 kasha iddin ana šarri* (*Ap-O-S-V(o)-A; u-S-O-V-A*) "moreover the king gave X to PN, and PN gave to king 300 silver" 11.22f.; *šanīta Y ana PN iddin šarru u PN 500 kasha ana šarri iddinšunu* (*Ap-O-A-V-S; u-S-O-A-V(o)*) 11.29ff.; *šanīta Z ana PN mār PN₂ šarru iddinšunu u 300 kasha ana šarri iddin* (*Ap-O-A-S-V(o); u-O-A-V*) 11.32ff.

ters, the Akk. rule of placing the verb last in a clause is carried out over three-fourths of the time. In one fairly long letter, 5:87f. (36 lines), all of the clauses are verb-final. However, that is exceptional; usually *most* of the clauses are verb final, while one or two are not (e.g., *3:5; *5:137; *5:141f.). Yet there is no pattern or predictability to the clauses in which the verb does not come at the end.

In the legal texts, less than one-third of the clauses are verb-final. In part, this is due to the great frequency of certain formulas, in which the verb is almost never last, e.g., the first two clauses of most texts: *ištu ūmi annim RN₁ mār RN₂ šar GN ittaši X u ittadinšu(nu)/iddinšu(nu) (šarru) ana PN* (Ap-S-V-O; u-V(o)-(S-)A) "From this day, RN₁, son of RN₂, king of GN, has taken X, and (the king) has given it(them) to PN" (e.g., 3:48b:1ff., and p.). The prohibitive clause with *lā ila/eqqe* (see above) is also very common, and usually not verb-final. But even when these are discounted, the number of verb-final clauses rises only to about half. Some texts, and therefore, presumably, some scribes, prefer them for the most part (e.g., 3:96f.; 3:91f.); but in many other texts, there are no verb-final clauses, or only one or two.

One rather peculiar tendency is that, in the legal texts, the verb is usually final in an injunction or prohibition (i.e., imper., prec., *lā* plus dur.), with the notable

exception of the ubiquitous *lā ila/eqqe* clauses mentioned above. As examples, note: *mamma ana PN lā iraggum* (S-A-*lā*-V) "no one may contest for PN" 3:70:10ff.; *bītu DN u kum-[rūšū](?) ana PN lā utebbū* (S-A-*lā*-V) "The temple of DN and its priests(?) may not rise up against PN" *ibid.*:21ff.⁴⁵⁹ In the letters, however, there are numerous commands in which the verb is not final.⁴⁶⁰

The subject, when it occurs, usually precedes the verb, whether the latter is clause-final or not.⁴⁶¹ The direct object is also usually found before the verb.⁴⁶² Adverbs and prepositional phrases, however, tend to follow the verb (except for negatives, and adverbial expressions found in clause-initial position, e.g., *urra šēra, šanīta, anumma*, etc.).⁴⁶³ Thus, the most common word order is (S-)(O-)V(-A) (parentheses indicate that not all clauses have all of these parts of speech). But this is merely the most frequent, not

⁴⁵⁹The only exceptions are *šanīta akil narkabti lā uma'er eli PN u eli mārišu* "Moreover the overseer of the chariotry may have no power over PN or his sons" 3:81:31ff., and *u hazannu āli u akil eqiṣti lā imallik elišu* "And the town mayor and the overseer of the lands may not command him" 3:135a:15f. (on *malāku* here, cf. CAD M/1, 158a).

⁴⁶⁰E.g., *3:19:22, 5:98:r11',14'; *5:137:8; 5:148:10,r9'.

⁴⁶¹Over eighty per cent of the time.

⁴⁶²Actually, a simple count would show that the object usually follows the verb, but that is because over a third of the examples are the initial clauses of legal texts (*ištu ūmi annīm RN...ittāši X*, where *X* is the object). Apart from these, the object precedes the verb in about two-thirds of the examples.

⁴⁶³In over three-fourths of the examples.

not the rule. Many other arrangements occur, some of them often: e.g., (S-) (O-) (A-) V,⁴⁶⁴ (S-) V-O(-A),⁴⁶⁵ V-S(-O) (-A).⁴⁶⁶ Conversely, some patterns are found only infrequently, or not at all. It is very unusual, e.g., for the subject, when it follows the verb, to be at all separated from it.⁴⁶⁷ It is also unusual for an adverbial phrase (except a sentence-initial one) to precede a direct object; this means that if the object follows the verb, an adverbial phrase, if there is one, almost invariably will as well.

Since the word order in so many clauses, or rather, the lack of a fixed word order, is not a feature of Akk. prose, we must look elsewhere for its origin. It is unlikely that the U scribes learned from Akk. poetry, where the word order is much freer, and equally unlikely that the word order is an invented feature (i.e., not a feature of any language known by the scribes). The most tempting source, naturally,

⁴⁶⁴E.g., *šanīta PN sittašunu ana ekalli išerreb* "More-over PN will take their shares to the palace" 3:82:16f.

⁴⁶⁵E.g., *šumma urra šēra PN inammuš dīna itti ahišu* "if in future PN begins legal action against his brother" 3:81:25ff.; here too belong the first clauses of most of the legal texts (see n. 462, above).

⁴⁶⁶E.g., *u ittadin šarru tu[ppa] ana PN* "And the king gave a tablet to PN" 3:94:r6'f. Usually, only a direct object (V-S-O) or only an adverbial phrase (V-S-A) occurs: e.g., *išši-mi RN 400 kaspā...* "RN took 400 silver..." 3:46:7f.; *enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardika* "When/Now then the king my lord has written to your servant" *3:5:9f.

⁴⁶⁷But note: *u ittaši 20 kaspā PN mCultša* "and PN her husband took 20 silver" *Syl*18:253f.:15f.

is Ugaritic, presumably the native language of most of these scribes. And there is in fact a substantial correlation between the word order in the Ugaritic prose texts and that of the Akk. material. Thus, in Ugaritic letters, the verb is quite often at the end,⁴⁶⁸ as in the U Akk. letters; and in the few Ugaritic legal documents (the ones that are not simply lists), the word order is usually (S-)V(-O) (-A),⁴⁶⁹ a common (but not the most common) pattern in the Akk. counterparts. However, it is very likely that the style of the Ugaritic documents was based on the Akk., and not vice versa.⁴⁷⁰ Thus, it is possible that the Ugaritic word order

⁴⁶⁸In over half the clauses that are both legible and intelligible. As an example, note *UT* 1013(p.218):16ff., which I would vocalize and translate as follows:

(16) <i>wa-him hattt</i> (17) <i>alā</i>	"And if the Hittites come up,
<i>wa-la'iktu</i> (18) <i>immaki</i>	I will send (word) to you.
<i>wa-him</i> (19) <i>lā alā</i>	But (even) if they do not come,
<i>wa-la'aku-ma</i> (20) <i>'il'aku</i>	I will certainly send word.
<i>wa-'atti</i> (21) <i>'umm</i>	So you, my mother, do not
<i>'al tidhalt</i>	be afraid;
(22) <i>wa-'ap m-h-k-m</i> (23)	and do not place worry(?)
<i>bi-libbiki</i> 'al (24) <i>tašt</i>	in your heart."

⁴⁶⁹In *UT* 1005, 1006, 1008, 1009 (pp. 216f.), this is the case in all but two of the verbal clauses (which are V-S-A).

As an example, note *UT* 1008:

(1) <i>li-yomi hanādi</i> (2) <i>RN₁ binu</i>	"From this day <i>RN₁</i> son of <i>RN₂</i>
<i>RN₂ malku</i> (3) <i>GN yatana</i> (4) <i>šadv</i>	king of <i>GN</i> gave the field of
<i>PN₁</i> (6-10 difficult)	<i>PN₁</i>
(11) <i>wa-yatana n-n</i> (12) <i>li PN₂</i>	And he gave them to <i>PN₂</i> son
<i>bini</i> (13) <i>PN₃ wa-li</i> (14)	of <i>PN₃</i> and to his sons
<i>bānthu</i> <i>adi</i> <i>olami</i>	forever.
(15) <i>šahra</i> <i>olamta</i> (16) <i>bunūšu</i>	In future, no one
<i>bunūšima</i> (17) <i>lā yiqqaq-n-n</i>	may take them from
<i>bē-di</i> (18) <i>PN₂ bini</i> <i>PN₃</i> (19)	<i>PN₂</i> son of <i>PN₃</i> or from
<i>wa bē-di bānthu</i> <i>adi</i> <i>olami</i>	his sons forever
<i>wa-'unu</i> <i>θu</i> (21) <i>'en bihu</i>	And there is no feudal service in it."

⁴⁷⁰Note, e.g., the great similarity in both content and style between *UT* 1008 (above, n. 469), and the royal grants in Akk. (e.g., 3:62f.; 3:118).

is also a reflection of that in the Akk., and that the latter was imported with the use of Akk. itself. That question is beyond the scope of this work, and the matter must remain open.⁴⁷¹

b. Clauses with the Stative.⁴⁷²

In the letters and legal texts, there are 66 clauses containing the stative which are preserved well enough to determine their syntax. Of these, 32 have the stative of *ṣamātu*, 18 of *zakû*; both of these groups are therefore treated separately here.

The clauses exhibit the following word orders:

V: *ṣamātu*: 3:63b:12; *zakû*: 3:70:20; 3:162b:9; 3:166:16'; *5:142:30 (with *lû*); other: 3:53b:13 (*hašāhu*); 5:8:8 (*rašāpu*).

A-V: *zakû*: 5:15:r3', 10'.

S-V: *ṣamātu*: 5:179:6(?).

S-A-V: *ṣamātu*: 3:52a:15f.; other: 3:84:24 (*anāhu*); 5:87:20ff., 22ff. (*ašābu*), 25 (*nadû*).

A-S-V: all *nadānu*: 3:142b:14f.; 3:161a:14ff.; 3:164b:13ff.

V-A: *ṣamātu*: 5:8f.:23; *zakû*: 6:48:16'; other: 3:68:

⁴⁷¹Perhaps there is some influence on the word order from Hurrian, where the pattern S-O-V-A is quite common; examples may be found in F. Bush, "A Grammar of the Hurrian Language" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1964), 257 (ex. 3), 259 (exx. 4-6), and p. Against this, perhaps, is the fact that, in the Amarna letters from Tushratta of Mittanni, the verb is usually at the end, often at the beginning of the sentence, but not in the middle; cf. H.-P. Adler, *AKTM* §62a, pp. 94f.; but note also §62b, p. 95.

⁴⁷²See the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

4ff. (*nadānu*); 5:8f.:22 (*qadāšu*).

A-V-A: 3:141:29 (*anāhu*).

S-V-A(-A): *ṣamātu*: 3:35a:7ff.; 3:86:r9'ff.; 3:96:18f.; 3:113:7ff.; 3:121:7ff.; 3:126:10ff.; 3:127f.:10ff., 25f.; 3:129:16f.; 3:130:7f., 9ff.; 3:138f.:8ff., 21ff.; 3:142a:9ff.; 3:143a:7ff.; 3:146:10ff.; 3:155a:8ff.; 3:160:17ff.; 5:8f.:13ff.; 5:9:10f.; 5:263:10ff.; 6:29:17ff.; *zakû*: 3:70:17ff.; other: 3:114:26ff. (*summuḫu*).

S-A-V-A(-A): *ṣamātu*: 3:89a:6f., 8f., 13f. (all logograms); 3:90b:12ff.

A-S-V-A: *ṣamātu*: 3:36a:11ff.

V-S: *zakû*: 3:78:14; other: 5:98:12(?; *hitaddû*); 3:53:11f. (*hašāhu*).

A-V-S: *zakû*: 3:32f.:4ff.; 3:68:16.

V-S-A: *zakû*: 3:46:11f.; 3:54a:12; 3:78:14f.; 3:82:12f., 19; 6:52b:8; other: 3:68:7f. (*nakāru*), 11f. (*nadānu*)

A-V-S-A: *zakû*: 3:110a:5f.(?).

The next paragraphs consist of a brief summary of these data.

A nominal subject occurs with the stative as follows:

with *ṣamātu*: S-V 30 V-S 0

with *zakû*: S-V 1 V-S 10

other: S-V 7 V-S 4.

Thus apart from *zakû*, the subject usually precedes the stative, as is the case with other verbal clauses.

A pronominal subject is of course not usually expressed.

In the two instances in which it is, the pronoun precedes the stative, as in classical Akk.:⁴⁷³ *šumma urra šēra anāku mītāku* 3:76a:14; *šunu sarrû* 3:98:24.

⁴⁷³Cf. G. Buccellati, *JNES* 28, p. 6, and n. 23.

The relative order of the stative and adverbs or adverbial phrases (discounting sentence-initial adverbs like *šanīta*, etc.) is:

with *ṣamātu*: V-A 29 A-V 6⁴⁷⁴

with *sakû*: V-A 9 A-V 5

other: V-A 6 A-V 7.

Apart from clauses with *ṣamātu* and *sakû*, then, adverbs follow and precede the stative about equally. The position of the subject relative to the verb has no apparent influence on the position of the adverb. It was noted above that in other verbal clauses, adverbs more often follow the verb.

c. Nominal Clauses.

i. with nominal predicate

There are several clauses which consist of a predicate only (with or without an introductory conjunction), i.e., which have no subject expressed. Examples are: *nidnu šarri* "(It is) a royal grant" 3:65b:14; *u 140 kasapyā ša irṭēhi* "But (there were) 140 silver of mine which remained (owing)" *3:19:9f.; *šumma urram šēram mannum-mē ša šarrutta ina libbi GN eppaš* "if in future (there is) someone who exercises kingship in GN" *6:3:24ff.

Usually, however, there is a subject expressed. When it is a noun, or noun phrase, it normally precedes the pre-

⁴⁷⁴The sum of these is larger than the total number of clauses due to those in which adverbs or adverbial phrases come both before and after the verb.

dicate: e.g., *anumma X kaspu annû šīm(u)ya ša taltāqū-mi*
 "Now then, this X silver is my payment which you have taken"
 3:170b:7'f.; *u PN₁ u PN₂ [u PN₃] mār PN₄ urubānū [š]a nāba-
 tīšū[nu]* "And PN₁, PN₂, and PN₃ son of PN₄ are the guarantors
 against their fleeing" 3:37b:5ff.; *u PN mūdū šarri* "and PN
 is a royal courtier" 3:84:20; 3:114:30f;⁴⁷⁵ with a relative
 clause as predicate: *kaspu annû ša muqqadim*⁴⁷⁶ *ša irtēh*
 "This silver is the pasture-tax which remained" 6:96b:6ff. (Ec.).
 In one expression, an adverbial phrase (part of the predi-
 cate) precedes the subject, for emphasis: *ana dāri dūri*
nīdnu annû nadin "Forever this grant is given" 3:142b:14f.;
 3:161a:13ff.; 3:164b:13ff.

There are several examples where the logical predicate
 precedes the subject; these seem to place emphasis on the
 predicate: *enūma sēr hurati qabūtuya* "Since/Now then h.-
 seed is my desire" *6:12:7f.; *inanna 7 eleppētu ša nakrī*
ša illakanni "Now seven were the enemies' ships which came
 to me" 5:87:27ff.⁴⁷⁷ In one instance, the predicate--two
 noun phrases each beginning with the determinative pronoun

⁴⁷⁵In both texts, and in 3:82:20f. and 3:85:15f. (see below), what follows this clause is *X kaspa uppal* "he will pay X silver." Nougayrol takes *PN mūdū šarri* as the subject of *uppāl*, and translates: "PN, compte du roi [X] (sicles d')argent apportera." However, it seems more likely that the texts are announcing both factors as new data, and therefore that two clauses are involved.

⁴⁷⁶On the form and meaning of this word, see CAD M/1, 252a.

⁴⁷⁷Cf. also probably 4 *meat kaspušunu* "Four hundred is their silver (i.e., price)" 3:103:14.

ša--is split, with the subject standing between the two phrases: ša PN-ma gabba u ša mārīšu ana dāri dūri "It is to PN that everything (belongs), and to his children, forever" 3:102:16f. From the context, and the -ma, it is quite clear that ša PN is being emphasized.⁴⁷⁸

When the subject is a pronoun, it follows the predicate in two examples: ištēn amēlu nēnu "We are one man" *3:19:24; note the change in word order in the following clauses:

(šumma...iqabbū) mā ul bēlni attā-mi šarru šanū bēlni "(if...they say:) you are not our lord; another king is our lord" 3:114:19f. The clauses in these examples exhibit the word order found in classical Akk. and in K.⁴⁷⁹ In other instances, however, the subject precedes the predicate, contrary to normal Akk. usage: šū urra šēra mūdū šarri "In future he is a royal courtier" 3:82:20f.; 3:85:15f.;⁴⁸⁰ šū zittašu "that is his share" 6:48b:7'; šīt bēltu bīti eli mārīši "She is the mistress of the estate, over her son" 3:86:23f.⁴⁸¹ Perhaps the order in these clauses is due to

⁴⁷⁸Compare a similar clause with normal word order: šanīta [panā]nam-ma(?) eqļu annū ša PN "Moreover previously(?) this field (belonged) to PN" 5:10:23f.

⁴⁷⁹Cf. G. Buccellati, *JNES* 27, 6ff. Von Soden (*GAG* § 126c,g), and E. Reiner (*Current Trends in Linguistics*, ed. T.A. Sebeok, Vol. 6 (Mouton: the Hague, 1970, 291f.), however, would both understand the pronoun as the predicate.

⁴⁸⁰See above, n. 475.

⁴⁸¹Note also **EA47:10f., in which the predicate is marked with -ma: [u i]nanna anāku ana šarri šamši [bēlīy]a lū ardam (IR.MEŠ)-ma "Now, I am indeed the servant of the king, the Sun, my lord." On the MEŠ, see above, pp. 172ff.

Ugaritic influence; note, e.g., at *aḥ an a[ḥtk]* "You are my brother; I am your sister" *UT 3 Aqht:1:24*, p. 249.

In one clause, a pronoun at the end resumes the subject:
u anumma arđūki arđū ša mārṭya šunu "And now, your 'servants are (also) my sons' servants"⁴⁸² *6:3:18f. This phenomenon was also encountered in K, where it was suggested that it is due to WS influence.⁴⁸³

ii. adverbial predicate

When the subject is a noun or noun phrase, it normally precedes the adverbial predicate: e.g., *kasap ipṭerṭšunu ana yāšī* "The silver for their ransom (will remain) with me" *3:19:15f.; *u kaspu u eql(ēt)u ana PN* "then the silver and field(s) (belong) to PN" 3:114:16,21; *X kaspi elṭšu* "he will owe X silver" 5:11:12, and often.

Conforming to this word order is the frequent greeting *lū šulmu ana muḥḥṭka* "Health be to you" e.g., 4:294:5, in which the optative particle *lū* precedes the subject.⁴⁸⁴ However, in this period, this form of the greeting (i.e., subject-predicate) is with one exception attested only in texts found at Ras Shamra,⁴⁸⁵ although it is found there in

⁴⁸²Nougayrol interprets this sentence as a question, and takes the first noun phrase as logical predicate: "Main-tenant, est-ce que sont (aussi) tes serviteurs les serviteurs de m[es] fils?" This rendering does not make this rather obscure passage any clearer, however, and so a more straightforward translation seems preferable; so also A.F. Rainey, *IOS 3*, 35.

⁴⁸³See above, pp. 96f.

⁴⁸⁴On *lū*, see below, pp. 321f.

⁴⁸⁵Cf. E. Salonen, *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*

texts from several areas.⁴⁸⁶ The exception is in a U text in the Amarna archives, EA49:4ff. (see below). The normal order in this period, in both native Akk. and WPA texts, is *ana (muhhi/mahar) X lū šulmu*,⁴⁸⁷ and in fact, as E. Salonen has noted,⁴⁸⁸ this is the order in texts found at Ugarit whenever *ana (muhhi)* is followed by a noun: e.g., *ana muhhi bēlīya lū šulmu ana bītīka sekrētīka*⁴⁸⁹ *ana gabbī mimmi ša bēlīya danniš lū šulmu* *3:5:5ff.⁴⁹⁰ With one exception, the order *lū šulmu ana muhhi X* occurs only, and always, when X is a pronominal suffix (-ka/-ki), as in 4:294:5, quoted above;⁴⁹¹ the exception is again EA49:4ff.: *lū šulmu ana*

in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen, St. Or. 38 (Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967), 60, 63ff. This order becomes very common in N/LB and NA letters; cf. *ibid.*, 86ff.

⁴⁸⁶Besides U, it occurs in K (e.g., 3:3:4, and often), and in texts from Amurru (e.g., PRU 4:214:4), from Siyannu (e.g., Ug. 5:126:4), from Alashiya (Ug. 5:85:5), and probably from Khatti (e.g., PRU 3:15:4, the origin of which is not absolutely certain).

⁴⁸⁷For MB texts found in Mesopotamia, see Salonen, *op. cit.* (above, n. 485), 60; note also the Amarna letters from Babylonia, EA2-4, 6-12; for WPA, note EA1,5 (Egypt); EA33, 35-40 (Alashiya); EA41 (Boghazkoy); also for Boghazkoy, see Labat, *AkkBo*, 214 (s.v. *šulmu*); for Alalakh (MB), note AT 109:4f.; 115:8f.

⁴⁸⁸*Op. cit.* (above, n. 485), 73.

⁴⁸⁹On this reading of Mī.UŠ (NIDLAM₂), cf. *Ahw*, 1036a (*sekretu* 3), and Labat, *MEA*, no. 554, p. 229.

⁴⁹⁰Cf. also 3:4:5ff.; 5:81:3'ff.; 5:87:6ff.; 5:97f.:5ff.; *5:137:14ff.; 6:5:5.

⁴⁹¹Also *3:19:r; 5:139:4; *5:141:4; 5:147:4; *6:12a:4. Without *lū*, note *anumma(?) iṭtu šulmu* "Now then(?) I am well(?)" 5:148:13. This text has *ittu* rather than *itti* also in *ll.14,r7'*. In the same text, Nougayrol restores

*muhhi šarri šamši bēlīya bīt[āttē]u.*⁴⁹² This example aside, the contrast in word order in the other texts is difficult to explain.⁴⁹³

The other clause type with the order predicate-subject is *ašrānu ittu*⁴⁹⁴ *ummiya mīnum-mē šulmānu* "There with my mother is there all well-being?" 5:148:r7'f.⁴⁹⁵ It was noted above (p. 98, n.251), that this formula is probably a question, and that that explains the reversal in the word order.

In one example, the subject is a pronoun, and follows the predicate adverb: *[ū] [k]iššū-ma*⁴⁹⁶ *šunū-ma* "and they (will be treated) similarly" 5:10:23

a-na m[uh-hi-ki šu]l-mu. However, the copy shows that there is enough room for *a-na m[uh-hi AMA-ia lu-ū šu]l-mu*, which would conform to the rule.

⁴⁹²This passage was apparently not noticed by Salonen, since he did not list *lū šulmu ana...* as a variant attested in the Amarna texts; cf. op. cit. (above, note 485), 63ff.

⁴⁹³This contrast of word orders also appears in Ugaritic letters; note: *yšlm . lk* "May it be well with you" *UT* 54:4, p. 175; 1015:4, p. 219; 2059:4, p. 17*; but *l . umy . yšlm* "May it be well with my mother" *UT* 117:6f., p. 189; 1013:5f., p. 218. Again, it seems just as likely that the Akk. order has influenced the Ugaritic as vice versa.

⁴⁹⁴On *ittu* see n. 491, above.

⁴⁹⁵Cf. also *5:137:19: *[u](?) ak-kāšī(?) ašrān[u mīnum-mē šulmāni]*; on *ak-kāšī* "with (to) you" (for Nougayrol's *ag-ga-ya*), see above, p. 191, n. 95.

⁴⁹⁶On *kīššū-ma*, see above, p. 277, s.v.

iii. clauses with *yānu*

Clauses which have as predicate the particle of non-existence *yānu* present a special case, for although the word is not a verb, it functions as one.⁴⁹⁶ In all but four cases, the noun which it negates is *pilku* or *ilku* "feudal service." The following represent all the clause types.

- (a) *u pilku yānu* 3:159a:18; cf. 3:142a:7.
- (b) *u pilku yānu ina eqli annī* 3:160a:25; cf. 3:116:r9'f.; 3:117:r10f.; 3:118:26f.; 3:122:18f.; 3:126:25f.; 3:136:22; 3:152:r4'; 6:45:26f.
- (c) *u pilka yānu* 3:134:26; cf. 3:129:17.
- (d) *u pilka yānu ina eqli annī ša GN* 3:128:17; cf. *ibid.*:30; 3:123:19f.; 3:125:r3'f.
- (e) *u ina bīti eqli ša GN pilku yānu* 6:33:21f.
- (f) *annaka asū yānu* EA49:24f.
- (g) *u pilku ina eqli šuwāti yānu* 3:146a:13.
- (h) *u pilka i[na eqli annī] yānu* 3:156:17f.
- (i) *kaspu unūtu gabbu mimmi ša ummi PN elīya yānu* 3:82:23ff.
- (j) *yānu rabū yānu qehru ina birīšunu* 5:173:5; cf. *5:146:14ff.

Thus, in all but two examples, the noun (phrase) precedes *yānu*; in the two clauses in (j), however, the "subject" follows. In those examples where (p)*ilku* is apparently the object of *yānu* (c,d,h), no subject is expressed.

When there is an adverb phrase dependent on *yānu*, it follows the particle 15 times (b,d,j), but precedes it only

⁴⁹⁶Cf. GAG §111b. See also below, pp. 320f.

five times (*e-i*).

Thus, the word order tends overwhelmingly to be S/O-*yānu*(-A), and in this regard, clauses with *yānu* parallel true verbal clauses.

2. Modification of the Noun

a. By an Adjective.

There are more adjectives attested in U than in K, but proportionately they probably occur no more frequently. Examples of those attested in the letters and legal texts are:

annû "this" p.;⁴⁹⁷ *damqu* "good, well made" 5:98:r9', 10', 13'; *eššu* "new" 3:52b:3; *rabû* "large, elder" 5: 173:5; *rēhu* "remaining" 3:57:17; *ṣēhru* "small, younger" 5:173:5; *šanû* "(an)other" p. (see below); *sakû* "pure, free (of claims)" 3:111:11.

Adjectives are naturally more frequent in economic texts, since these often involve descriptions of the entries. Very often, the adjectives there are written logographically (e.g., 3 TÚG.MEŠ GAL 6 TÚG.MEŠ TUR.MEŠ "3 large garments, 6 small garments" 6:99c:1f.); but syllabic spellings also occur (e.g., *re-qu* "empty" 6:120a:5, 7⁴⁹⁸).

⁴⁹⁷See above, p. 204.

⁴⁹⁸The form (*la*) *ša/šal-li-ma* (5:189f.:p.), following IR(.MEŠ), is obscure. It is presumably an adjective ("complete"?), but the acc. case and intermittent double *-li-* are puzzling. If the *-li-* is in fact single, the form would be Ugaritic (**šalima*), since in Akk. the *i* would be syncopated. But double writings of single consonants are rare in U; see above, 175f.

Agreement is discussed below in section 3; for adjectives, see pp. 314f.

In all but one instance, adjectives follow the noun. The exception is: *ša-nu pilku yānu* "There is no other feudal service" 3:126:25f; cf. *šarru ša-nu bēlni* "Another king is our lord" 3:114:20.

Adjectives modifying nouns in the bound form always follow the nomen rectum, as in *kunuk šarri GAL-bu* "the great royal seal" 3:49:25. Those modifying unbound nomina regentia (i.e., nouns followed by the gen. with *ša*) may occur either before or after the gen. (examples below, b ii). Adjectives always precede attributive relative clauses (examples below, c).

b. By a Noun in the Genitive.

i. As in K,⁴⁹⁹ the most common means of expressing a genitive relationship is the use of the bound form. Unlike K, however, the bound form remains more prevalent than the use of *ša* even when high-frequency nouns, which always or nearly always occur in the bound form when nomina regentia (e.g., *šarru, māru, (ana) muhhi*, etc.), are discounted. A few examples will suffice (more are cited above, pp. 219ff.): *bēltu bīti* "the mistress of the estate" 3:86:23; *taptātu eqlāt FN* "The new land of FN's fields" 3:139:19; *kubbudāti šarri* "honorific gifts for the king" 3:99a:8. In two instances, the particle *-ma* breaks up the construct chain:⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁹See above, pp. 99f.

⁵⁰⁰In Ugaritic, enclitic *m* may appear on the bound form;

*pilka-ma mur'ū*⁵⁰¹ *rābiši* "the service of the prefect's m.-officials" 3:146:14; *ina qāti(m)-ma amīlī GN* "in the hands of the men of GN" 3:98:7',11'. Otherwise, the nomen rectum always follows the bound form immediately.⁵⁰²

Rarely, a single bound form may govern more than one nomen rectum: e.g., *šīm bīti eqlī* "the price of the house (and) field" 3:89b:7; *ištu qāti akil narkabti u hazanni* "From (the hand of) the overseer of the chariotry and the mayor" 3:84:22. However, *ša* is also used in such cases (see below, ii). I can find no certain instances in which a single nomen rectum is governed by more than one bound

cf. *UT* §8.16, p. 56. Note that in other examples, *ša* is used when *-ma* occurs on the nomen regens: e.g., *pilka-ma ša namūti* 3:116:r10'; cf. 6:33:22f.

⁵⁰¹*mur'ū*, also in the bound form (pl.), is in the wrong case; gen. *mur'ī* is expected.

⁵⁰²In 3:93b:11, Nougayrol takes *a-na UD.MEŠ TE TIL.LA. MEŠ PN* as *ana ūmī balāṭ(i) gamrūti PN*, i.e., "pour tous les jours de la vie de PN." If this were correct, it would mean that an adjective (*gamrūti*) stood between the bound form and its genitive. However, *CAD B*, 51 (*balāṭu* 2 b) suggests *ana UD.MEŠ-te TIL.LA.MEŠ PN* (for *ana ūmāte(?) balāṭ PN*) "during the lifetime of PN." The usual logogram in Akk. for *balāṭu* is *TI(.LA)*; however, *TIL(.LA)* occurs *p.* in the Amarna letters (cf. *EA II*, 1388). Still, there is a problem in creating a plural of *ūmu* in *-t-*, which would be attested in *U* only here and in the other examples of this expression. They are: *i-na UD-mī-ti ba-la-ṭī-šu* 3:92:13; *i-na UD.1.KAM.MEŠ-ti TIL.LA-šu* 3:132:23. The first example is particularly difficult because of the plural(?) *ūmīti(?)*; perhaps in this case, Nougayrol's interpretation should be retained, in which *TI* is the logogram for the following *balāṭīšu*. For a parallel example, i.e., one in which a logogram is glossed by a syllabic spelling without a preceding "Glossenkeil," note, e.g., *šum-ma...a-na-ku BA.UG7 mī-ta-ku* "if...I die" 3:76a:4f.

form (i.e. *X u Y Z "the X and Y of Z").⁵⁰³ *ša* is used in such cases (see below, ii).

ii. The use of *ša* for the genitive relationship is not rare, but it is not nearly as common as the simple bound form. There are, however, a few conditions under which the use of *ša* seems preferred. One occurs when the nomen regens is modified by an adjective: note, e.g., *bīta ešša ša PN* "PN's new house" 3:52b:3; *1 qašta damiqta ša GN* "one good bow from GN" 5:98:r10',13'. Yet in some instances, the bound form is used, and the adjective comes after the gen.: *nidnūt!*⁵⁰⁴ *šarri annūti* "these royal grants" 3:148a:16.⁵⁰⁵ And in others, the adjective follows the gen. even though *ša* is used: *nadāna ša šarri annā* "this royal gift" 3:118:21f. *ša* is also employed when the gen. modifies a string of nouns:⁵⁰⁶ e.g., *bītu eqlu immerātu alpū maršītu ša PN* "PN's house, field, sheep, oxen, and (other) property" 3:102:4; *[tu]ppa u kunukka ša šarri* "the royal tablet and seal" 3:56:2. It may also be used when more than one gen. modifies

⁵⁰³In 5:8f.:19f., read probably *aššum epēši u [X] bīt kunahi*, where *X* is probably another infinitive (e.g., *rašāpu*; see below, p. 360, and n. 684). Since the nomen regens of the object is a logogram (É), it cannot be determined whether the infinitives are in construct to a following genitive, (the case-ending would be normal in U; see above, 220f.), or whether they take *bīt kunahi* as a direct object (acc.). In favor of the former alternative is *ana ša'āli'sulmi* in 4:294:9f.

⁵⁰⁴SUM<.MEŠ>.

⁵⁰⁵Cf. also 3:49:26, cited above in section a.

⁵⁰⁶Cf. *GAG* §138b.

a nomen regens: *eqļu ša PN₁ u ša PN₂ u ša PN₃ u ša PN₄ 3:159:6ff.* Finally, there is a tendency for *ša* to be used when the nomen regens is a non-Akk. word: e.g., *unuššū*⁵⁰⁷ *ša bītī* "the feudal service of the estate" 3:53b:20 (but also *unušša bītātī* 3:63a:17); *ma(')šara*⁵⁰⁸ *ša GN* "the tithe of GN" 3:93b:7; *marzi'z*⁵⁰⁹ *ša šatrana* "the m.'s of š" 3:130:4,7, 10f., 15f.⁵¹⁰

In the only text in which *qātātī šabātu* "to guarantee"⁵¹¹ occurs, the idiom was apparently so strongly felt to be a unit that the gen. was placed after the verb; therefore, *ša* has to be used: *PN₁...u PN₂...qātattī iṣṣabat ša PN₃* "PN₁...and PN₂...guaranteed PN₃" 3:37a:1ff.; cf. 9ff.

Apart from these observations, there appear to be no other determining factors governing the choice of either the bound form or *ša*. Other examples of the latter are: *šimti*

⁵⁰⁷This word may be an Akk. *puruss* type (cf. Nougayrol's comments, *PRU* 3, 227). However, since it is not attested outside these texts, but does occur in Ugaritic (*unθ*, e.g., *UT* 1006:16,19; 1008:20; 1009:18), it is probably foreign in Akk.

⁵⁰⁸This is not attested in Ugaritic, although the root *cšr* "ten" is; cf. *UT* §7.18, p. 45, and §7.55, p. 49.

⁵⁰⁹Cf. Ugaritic *mršcy*, *UT* §2313, p. 483.

⁵¹⁰Note also 3:41a:3 (*huburtanūru*; Ugaritic *hbrtnr UT* §925, p. 400); 3:37b:7 (*urubānu*; Ugaritic *ʿrbnm UT* §1915, p. 461); 6:33:23 (*maryannūti*); 3:134:26 ([*kakkaru*]; cf. perhaps Ugaritic *kkrdn UT* 169:r10); probably also the word *pīlku*, although it is not attested in Ugaritic (e.g., 3:67b:11; 3:77b:8; but note the bound form 3:89:18f.); perhaps also *bītu*: *KU-bu-ri ša PN* 3:51b:8, unless this is *qubūru* "grave."

⁵¹¹Cf. *CAD* §, 32a, where it is noted that the proper expression is *qātātī leqū*; see *CAD* L, 145b.

ša mārīšu "the final will for his sons" 3:56:4, but *šimti*⁵¹²
bītīšu 5:10:3; *ana ša'ali šulmi ša šarri* "to inquire after
the king's well-being" 4:294:9f.; *kasap hubullī ša bītī* "the
silver of the estate's debts" 3:60b:16f.

iii. The construction *X-šu ša Y* for "the X of Y" occurs
much more frequently in U than in K.⁵¹³ However, it is at-
tested only in the legal texts. There, it is most often
found in the first clause of the text, in which the object(s)
of the transaction is(are) first mentioned. Also, it is
much more common in royal grant texts than other types of
transactions, and, finally, more common in texts from the
reign of Niqmaddu II than in texts of later kings' reigns.
As an example, note *ištu ūmi annīm RN...ittaiši bītšu eqelšu*
gabba mimmīšu ša PN "From this day RN...took the estate,
field, all the property of PN" 3:48:1ff.; cf. 3:53:1ff.; 3:
65:1ff., and often.⁵¹⁴ The construction is also common
elsewhere, however: e.g., *ištu ahhišu ša PN* "from PN's
brothers" 3:102:14. As the examples show, the nomen rectum
is usually a person (especially a PN); however, there are
exceptions: e.g., *še'su šikaršu ša : ma'sarīša* "the grain
and beer of its tithe" 3:147a:10f. The pronominal suffix is

⁵¹²On this form, see above, p. 219, n. 198.

⁵¹³Above, pp. 101f., q.v., for a discussion on the
origin of the construction.

⁵¹⁴All the references given are from the reign of Niq-
maddu II. The construction is not attested in the few texts
from Arhalbu's reign. For Niqmepa, note, e.g., 3:101:1ff.;
for Ammistamru II, 3:123:6, 11.

almost always -šu, but that is because it agrees in number and gender with the genitive, which is usually ms.⁵¹⁵ Otherwise, note: *eqlēti gabba mī[mm]tšīna ša mārāt PN₁ u ša mārāt PN₂* "the fields, all the property of PN₁'s daughter and PN₂'s daughter" 5:13:4f.⁵¹⁶

This construction seems to be completely interchangeable with that using only *ša*. Thus, e.g., the -šīna of the last example is not necessary; nor is -šu in *šumma ahūšu ū šumma māršu ša PN* "whether PN's brother or son" 3:114"27. Note also: *ana kallūtīšu ša PN* "in marriage to PN" 3:60b:9, but *ana kallūti ša PN* in 1.13. In some cases, all three types of construction are equivalent: e.g., *ištu ūmi annīm RN...iddin bītšu ša PN₁ u 2 bītātu ša PN₂ eqelšu ša PN₃ eqelšu ša PN₄ eqel šarri ina GN₁ eqel PN₅ ina GN₂...RN...ittadinšu[nu]* "From this day RN...has given PN₁'s estate. And RN...has given 2 estates of PN₂, the field of PN₃, the field of PN₄, the royal field in GN₁, the field of PN₅ in GN₂" 3:47a:1ff. Also compare the following: *pilka bītīšu uppal* "will be responsible for the feudal service of his estate" 3:89:18f., but *pilka ša bīti uppal* 3:67b:11, and *pilkašu ša eqli šuwāti*

⁵¹⁵There are a few possible exceptions to this; note: *pilkašu ša LÚ.MESDAM.GĀR-ut-ti* 6:32a:9; perhaps "traders" is the meaning of the last word, but it is more likely that it is an abstract noun, "occupation of trader" (cf. *AHW*, 1315b). Again, in *pilkašu ša LÚŠĀ.TAM.MEŠ*, 3:132:30, the logogram is more likely for *šatammūtu* "office of steward" (cf. *AHW*, 1199b), than *šatammū* "stewards" (on *MEŠ* in U, see above, pp. 172ff.).

⁵¹⁶Note perhaps also *panūšunu ša* ["the faces of ..."
**EA46:10'.

PN ul uppal 3:96:15ff.

iv. The fourth means of expressing a genitive relationship which occurs in K, namely *ša X Y-šu* "the Y of X" (see above, 102ff.), is not attested in U.

c. By a Relative Clause.

Relative clauses are considered in detail below, pp. 332ff. Here it is only to be noted that most of them are adjectival.⁵¹⁷ If the noun is also modified by an adjective or nomen rectum, the relative clause comes last: e.g., *bīta šanā ša rābiṣu ittadinšu* "Another house which the prefect gave" 3:90b:10f.; 2 *bītāt PN₁ ša [inal] panānu ana PN₂* "two estates of PN₁ which formerly belonged to PN₂" 3:103:13. No examples of the *bīt imqutu* or *bīt ṭpušu* constructions occur in U.⁵¹⁸

d. By a Noun in Apposition.⁵¹⁹

As in K, a few examples will illustrate this means of modification: *PN 2000 kaspa šīm bīti eqli ana šarri ittadinšu* "PN gave the king 2000 silver, the price of the house and field" 3:89b:6f.; *šībūtu ša GN PN₁...PN₂...u akil lim amīlu annūtu...līrubū* "May the witnesses of GN, PN₁...PN₂...and

⁵¹⁷Cf. GAG §165e.

⁵¹⁸Unless one considers [*mannu*]m-mê...*inakkir* "anyone who(whoever)...disputes" in 3:108:19f. to be an example (vs., e.g., *mannum-mê...ša izziz* "anyone...who disputes" Syl8:249:16f.); see above, p. 205f., n. 143.

⁵¹⁹GAG §134.

the overseer-of-a-thousand--these men--enter" *5:142:21ff. There are also many instances of apposition to a PN, in which an individual's profession, or some characteristic, is noted: e.g., *PN tupšarru* "PN the scribe" 3:68:7. Occasionally, the appositive noun is separated from the noun it modifies, e.g., by a verb: *20 kaspā uppal mūdātšu* "He will pay 20 silver (as) his *mūdū*-tax" 3:162b:7. Finally, note the use of an appositive accusative to express intent in 6:27:5'ff., quoted below, p. 364.

3. Agreement

As in K, there are very few instances of lack of concord in the letters. The legal documents, on the other hand, exhibit numerous examples. Again, as in K, many of these are due to the formulaic nature of such texts.

Lack of agreement between subject and verb is not uncommon. Normally, a pl. subject takes a pl. verb: e.g., *FN u PN...ittāšūni...u itta[di]nūšunu...PN u FN...uppalū* "FN and PN....took...and gave...PN and FN will be responsible for..." 3:61:4ff.; *ša iltarqū amīlū GN* "which the men of GN stole" *5:141:7ff. But there are many exceptions:⁵²⁰
hazannu āli u akil eqlēti lā imallik elīšu "The town mayor and the overseer of the fields may have no power over him"

⁵²⁰Unless context demands a pl., words with MEŠ or HI.A as determinative are treated as sg. if the verb is sg.; cf. above, pp. 172ff. Of course, certainty is often impossible in such cases. In *Syl8:252:21f.*, *summa PN ū mārūšu itūr* "if PN or his sons return," the verb agrees with the first of the alternative subjects.

3:135a:15f.; $PN_1...u PN_2...qātattī iṣṣabat ša PN_3$ " $PN_1...and PN_2...guaranteed PN_3$ " 3:37a:1ff. (cf. 11.9ff.: $PN_4...qātattī iṣṣabat ša PN_5$); (*šumma...*) *ahhū ša PN itūr ana PN* "if PN's brothers turn against him" 3:33a:1lf. (cf. *šumma PN itūr in 11.14f.*);⁵²¹ *mārū PN usakkīšū* "the sons of PN freed him (PN_2)" 3:154:14f.; note also with the stative: *zaki PN zaki mārūšū* "PN is free; his sons are free" 3:78:14;⁵²² prec.: *ilānu šumšu lihalliḳ* "May the gods destroy his name" 3:105:56f.; etc.⁵²³ Finally, *bašū* is always ms, regardless of its subject:⁵²⁴ *šumma elepp[ētu] ša nakrī šanāt[u]*⁵²⁵ *ibašši* "if the enemies' ships are (again) present" 5:88:32ff.

It was noted above (p. 225), that nouns preceded by numerals are treated as sg. in U; thus, their predicates are sg.: e.g., 4 *eqū*^{MES} *šamit* "the 4 fields are transferred"

⁵²¹But note pl. *itūrūni* 3:114:14; 3:170b:12'.

⁵²²The stative *šamiṭ* is nearly always sg. even when the subject is pl.: e.g., 3:126:11ff.; but *šamatū* 3:93b:13. :

⁵²³With subject *eleppētu*, the verbs *illaka!* and *illa-kanni* in 5:87:13,29 could be f. pl.; but it is more likely that they are m. sg. See above, pp. 231f. In 5:263b:3ff., *DUMU-ru PN ipšur eqlētīšunu qadu eqli ša ilteqe* "The son(s) of PN released his/their field along with the field he/they had taken," *DUMU-ru* could indicate the pl. However, we would expect *DUMU.MES* for the pl. (and note *LUGAL-ru* for *šarru*, sg., 6:44f.:18,28,20); it is thus possible that one son is meant, and that we should emend to *eqlētīšū<<nu>>*. In *5:137:6ff., the sense requires that the sg. verb of the relative clause go with the pl. *amīlī*: *anumma ištēn amīla ina libbi amīlī ša ašrānu itt[īka w]ašib leqe* "Take one man from among the men who are living there with you."

⁵²⁴Cf. *GAG* §132g.

⁵²⁵Reading *ša-na-ṭāḷ*; this seems preferable to creating a new word *šanā'is* "again," as P.-R. Berger does in *UF* 1, 220 (accepted by von Soden in *AHw*, 1161a).

5:263a:10f.

There are very few cases of a sg. subject with a pl. verb: note *umallūni* "he will pay" 3:37a:16, influenced by the correctly pl. (and identical) form in 1.8;⁵²⁶ perhaps also *šumma [mann]um-ma ušamraṣūšunūti* "if someone(?) gives them trouble" *6:3:27; but the break makes the subject uncertain.⁵²⁷

In one instance, a f. pl. noun has a m. pl. predicate: *gabbu ʿeleppētūya ina GN ašbū* "All my ships are stationed in GN" 5:87:22ff. Perhaps the f. pl. of verbs was the same as the m. p. (i.e., both -ū) in U, as was suggested for K (above, p. 54). It is also possible, however, that this form was influenced by *ašbū* (with m. p. subject) in 1.22. In 3:55:17, the 3fs verb is *uṣṣi*, whereas elsewhere in this text the 3fs always has a *t*- prefix (11.19,20,21,22,25).⁵²⁸ Whether *uṣṣi* is thus a case of lack of agreement (m. for f.), or both prefixes were acceptable to this scribe, cannot be determined.⁵²⁹

⁵²⁶Cf. *PRU* 3, 37, n. 1.

⁵²⁷Perhaps the form is a subjunctive, after *šumma*; cf. 4:54:12f. in K, discussed above, 62f. The extreme rarity of the subjunctive in U (above, p. 242f.) makes this unlikely, however.

⁵²⁸And elsewhere in U, except for text 3:110a; see 228f.

⁵²⁹Note also *ki-ma DUTU za-ak-ki* 3:110a:5. The verbal adjective of *zakū* here (the extra *k* is peculiar; Ass. D?) may either be in the predicative state, i.e., *zak(k)i*, or the normal unbound state, i.e. *zak(k)i*. The former is more likely due to the lack of full writing of the final vowel (but cf., e.g., LUGAL *ša-nu* "another king" 3:114:20). In either case,

Changes in person occur sporadically, especially in the letters, where there is a tendency to lapse, from the formality of addressing a superior in the third person, into the second person. An example is: *enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi arđika* "Since the king my lord (the addressee) has written to your servant" *3:5:9f.

Adjectives nearly always agree with the nouns they modify: e.g., *nidnu annū* "this grant" 3:117:r11; *ina eqlēti* : *harṣāti* "in plowed(?) fields" 3:95:11; *ana māti šanīti* "to another country" 3:37a:6,14; etc. There are a few mistakes, however:⁵³⁰ e.g., wrong case: *eqla^{MEŠ} qallu* (acc.) "the small(?)⁵³¹ field" 3:112a:5;⁵³² wrong gender: *tuppāti sar-rūti* "false tablets" 3:97:17f.⁵³³ There was also apparently some confusion as to the gender of a small number of words in the plural: *SUM.MEŠ-ti⁵³⁴ an-na-ti* "these grants" 3:145:27, but *SUM.MEŠ-ti an-nu-ti* in l.31 (also 3:116:r10'); A.Š.Š.

the problem is that the sun-god is normally treated as f. in U, not m. as here; note, in the predicate state: *ki-ma* [DUTU] *sa-ka-at* 3:107b:5f.; in the normal state: *ki-ma* DUTU *sa-ki-ti* 3:57:14; cf. 3:111:10.

⁵³⁰Note that nouns with MEŠ or HI.A, which have sg. adjectives, are assumed to be sg.; see above, pp. 172ff. The assumption may be incorrect at times, adding to the number of errors.

⁵³¹Cf. AHW, 894b (*qallu* 2).

⁵³²In (acc.) *tuppu annām* "this tablet" 3:105:56, it is the noun that is in the wrong case.

⁵³³On *ki-ma* DUTU *sa-ak-ki* 3:110a:5, see n. 529, above.

⁵³⁴No pl. forms of *nidnu* are listed in AHW, 786b.

MEŠ⁵³⁵ *an-na-ti* "these fields" 3:126:26 (cf. A.ŠĀ.HI.A : *ra-ba-ti* 5:114; A.ŠĀ.MEŠ *ku-ub-sā-ti*, *ki-na-ti* 3:48a:10,16; and 3:95:11 quoted above), but A.ŠĀ.HI.A *an-nu-(ū-)ti* 3:123:19; 3:136:23; 6:45:22,27.

Pronouns are consistently the same gender as the nouns to which they refer, with three exceptions: 3:110a, which always has *-šu* for the 3fs (11.8,11,17); the same text has m. verbs for the 3fs (11.7,13) contrary to normal U usage;⁵³⁶ 3:64:4f.: *FN ilteqēša* "FN took it(m.)," in which subject and object have been reversed, presumably due to Hurrian influence;⁵³⁷ and in the salutation of letter *6:2f., which is addressed to a woman, where the 2ms suffix occurs instead of the f. (11.6f.), undoubtedly because of the formulaic nature of the clause.⁵³⁸

Otherwise, there is a pronounced tendency for sg. pronominal suffixes to replace pl. forms. The latter do occur: e.g., *RN...ittāši X eqla...u Y eqla...u Z eqla...[u ilddin-*

⁵³⁵*eqlu* is normally f. in the pl., but occasionally m. in Nuzi; cf. CAD E, 249b (*eqlu*, heading).

⁵³⁶See above, 228f.

⁵³⁷In Hurrian's ergative system, when both a subject and object (in English or Akk. terms) are expressed, the "subject" appears in the verb as an agentive suffix; cf. F. Bush, "Hurrian," 206ff. The Hurrian influence in 3:64:4f. was first suggested by Gordon, in *RA* 50, 129. This feature occurs sporadically in Nuzi; cf. Gordon, *OrNS* 7, 221; Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadischen*, 61ff., and the literature cited there. See also A.D. Kilmer, *JAOS* 94 (1974), p. 179.

⁵³⁸The woman is even called *bēlīya* in 1.7. Cf. *PRU* 6, 2, n. 5.

šunu...amīlu mamman lā ilaqqēšunu... "RN...took X field... and Y field...and Z field (etc.), and gave them...No one may take them..." 3:122f.:2ff.; cf. 3:129a; 3:133; 3:135f.; etc. The sg. forms, however, occur almost as often as the pl. when the latter are expected:⁵³⁹ e.g., RN...ittāši X eqla ...u Y eqla...u ittadinšu...mannum-mē lā ilaqqēšu 3:75b:2ff.; cf. 3:112a; 3:126; 3:142b; etc. In not a few texts, both -šu and -šunu refer to the same object (pl.) or group of objects: e.g., RN...ittāši bīt PN₁ u bīta ešša...u gabba eqlēti ša PN₁ u iddinšu ana PN₂ mārīšu...išēnēšu PN₁ abūšū-ma iddinšunu u šanām RN šarru iddinšu RN...took the house of PN₁ and the new house and all the fields of PN₁ and gave it to PN₂ his son...First it was PN₁ his father who gave them and secondly RN the king gave it" 3:96f.:2ff.; u PN X...u Y ittašīšu u iddinšunu "And PN took (it) X...and Y and gave them" 3:85:7ff.; cf. also 3:53a:22ff.; 3:108f. (iddinšu l.8, but ileqqēšunu l.14); 3:148f. (ittadinšunu l.7, but ilaqqēšu l.10). Note also šanīta 2 bītāt PN₁...inanna šarru ana PN₂ iddinšu 400 kaspušunu "Moreover the 2 houses of PN₁... the king has now given to PN₂; their price (lit.: silver) is 400" 3:103:13f., but šanīta 2 bītāt PN₃ iddinšunu ana PN₃ in l.22.

⁵³⁹In many cases, the pronoun may refer to a catch-all word at the end of a series, and so be correctly sg.: e.g., RN...ittāši bītšu eql/eqlēti^{HI}.Ašū gabba mimmišu ša PN nayyāli u iddinšu... "RN...took the house, the field(s), (i.e.,) everything of PN the defaulter, and gave it..." 3:60:21ff.; cf. 3:53b; and often.

Nougayrol misunderstood a number of points that bear on the subject of concord in U, namely, that adjectives nearly always agree with their nouns (see above), that nouns after numbers are sg. (see p. 225), and that both MEŠ and HI.A may or may not indicate plurality (see pp. 172ff.). The result is that a great many texts in his transliterations exhibit lack of agreement, when there is none; i.e., the U texts are actually much more consistent in this regard than his transliterations show. A good example is 6:44f. In 1.5, he has: *6 ikû [eqlât]i^H*,⁵⁴⁰ but in 1.10, *eq[la]^H an[-na-]a*, referring to the same grant; in 1.16 (a different grant), *3 ikû e[qlât]i*, but *it-ta-din-šu* referring to it in 1.18; in 11.22,27, there is *eqli^H an-nu-(ú-)ti*. The text probably has no lack of agreement at all (on the m. pl. of *eqlu*, see above). Lines 4ff. should be read as follows: *PN₁... ip-ta-ṭar 6(?) ikû(GĀN) [eql]i(A.ŠĀ.HI.A) ša PN₂ ša ina eqel/eqli(A.ŠĀ.HI.A) n[i(?)]-ig-ḡi₅-ṣi⁵⁴¹... [LÚ] ma-[am- m]a-an la-a i-la-qe eqla(A.ŠĀ¹.HI.A) a[n-na]-a iš-tu qa-ti PN₁ "PN₁...redeemed 6 ikû's of the field of PN₂ which is in the field(s) of the 'cleft'(?)...No one may take this field from PN₁"; 11.14ff.: *ša-ni-ta₅ RN...it-ta-ši 3 ikû(GĀN) eqli(A.ŠĀ.HI¹.A) ša PN₃ ù it-ta-din-šu LUGAL-ru a-na PN₁**

⁵⁴⁰The symbol ^H is for HI.A in Nougayrol's system.

⁵⁴¹I.e., perhaps *nigigṣu* "cleft, fissure," perhaps referring to a prominent landmark in the area. On the double -gg-, note *ni-en-gi₅-ṣa-at*, i.e., *nigigṣāt+nigigṣāt* in KBo 13:1:r10, cited in AHW, 787b.

"Moreover RN...took 3 *ikā*'s of the field of PN₃ and gave them (lit.: it) to PN₁." Lines 21ff. refer then to both transactions: ...*Lū ma-am-ma-an l[a-a] i-la-qe eqlī*(A.ŠĀ.HI.A) *an-nu-ti iš-tu qa-ti PN₁...đ il-ku mim-ma ia-a-nu i-na eqlī*(A.ŠĀ.HI.A) *an-nu-ū-ti* "No one may take these fields from PN₁...There is no feudal service in these fields."

4. *Unspecified (Impersonal) Subject*

As in K, the 3mp is employed to express an unspecified subject (or instead of a passive). Considering the number of texts in the corpus, there are very few examples: *ubru*⁵⁴² *ana bītīšū lā ušerrebū* "the u.-official will not be allowed to enter" 3:84:23; *gabba ša ibašši biri FN u biri PN izūzū* "Everything present was divided between FN and PN" 5:173:21ff.; cf. 3:66a:9ff.; *u unušša ša bīti uppalū* "One will be responsible for the feudal service of the estate" 3:53b:20. Note also *PN ša taba''ū*⁵⁴³ *GN* "PN who is sought in GN" 6:74b:1f.

A 3ms impersonal verb may occur in *6:12a:11ff.: *il-te-qè* "one took"; however, this should probably be emended to *il-le!-qè* (N), as suggested by Nougayrol.⁵⁴⁴

⁵⁴²Perhaps the nom. is used because the word was felt to be the logical subject. However, several other instances of incorrect nom. forms are attested, in which this interpretation would not be possible; see above, on the declension of the noun, pp. 217f.

⁵⁴³On this reading, see above, pp. 230f.

⁵⁴⁴See above, p. 249.

5. Negation

The negative adverbs *lā*⁵⁴⁵ and *u*⁵⁴⁶ each occur in both the letters and the legal texts. Overall, *lā* occurs about three times more often than *u*. Due to the preponderance of legal texts, they usually express prohibition (negative commands).⁵⁴⁷ In this use, *u* occurs, with very few exceptions, only with the verbs *leqû*, *erēbu*, and *ekēmu*. *lā* occurs more often than *u* with *leqû* and *erēbu*, but never with *ekēmu*; and it is used in nearly all other prohibitions. Some examples: *mamman...u* *ekkimšu* "No one may take it" 3:46:21ff.; in 3:128, note *amīlu mamman u* *ilaqqēšu* 1.14, but *amīlu mamman lā* *ilaqqēšu* 1.27;⁵⁴⁸ *hasannu āli u* *akīl eqlēti lā* *imallik elīšu* "The town mayor and the overseer of the fields may have no power over him" 3:135a:15f.; *u lā* *tašakkan hubullam-mi ina berīni* "Do not put interest between us" *3:19:22f.

Both adverbs occur in simple assertions: *u šarru lā* *iddūkšānūt[i]* "but the king did not kill them" 3:97:22;

⁵⁴⁵Written both *la* and *la-a*, p. In 6:74b(Ec.), *lā* has twice been combined with the following word, which in each case began with *a*:- *la-lak* for *lā allak* (1s dur.) in 1.4; *la-li-ku* for *lā ālikū* (participle) in 1.9.

⁵⁴⁶Written both *u* and *ū-u*, p.

⁵⁴⁷There is often a fine line between prohibition and simple assertion; note, e.g., *ubru* [*an*] *a bītīšu u* *errub-ma alapšu imēršu...u* *gabbu mimmišu ana* *ekalli u* *errub-ma* "The u.-official may/will not enter his house, and his ox, ass, ..., and everything of his will (do not have to) enter the palace" 3:161:20ff.

⁵⁴⁸Similarly in 3:169:8f. (*u*), 17ff. (*lā*); note *lā irag-gum* "may not contest" in 1.18. In 3:98, we have *lā e-ru-b[u]* "may not enter" in 1.25, but *u* *i-r[u-bu]* in 1.26.

[ad]ēni ul ikšūdanni "they have not reached me as yet" 5:87:24; also in questions: abūya ul ī[d]e "Does my father not know?" *ibid.*:19, but enūma atta šiprāti ša harrāni lā tīde "Now then, do you not know the affairs of (my) trip?" *5:145f.:9f. In a non-verbal clause, ul is used: ul bēlmi attā-mi "you are not our lord" 3:114:20.

In the sole subordinate clause with a negative, and in protases after šumma, only lā is attested: adi lā iddin-mi ardīka "as long as he had not given your servants" *3:19:13f.; šumma...lā tamang[ur] "if... (FN) does not agree" 3:60b:10ff.; šumma PN imāt u FN...l[ā] uṣṣi "if PN dies and FN...does not want to leave" 3:55:15ff.; cf. also *5:142:19f. No negatives occur in any of the relative clauses.

To negate a word that is not the predicate, lā is used: amāt [l]ā [b]lanīta "an improper (or evil) thing" 5:87:16f.

The particle yānu⁵⁴⁹ is used to predicate non-existence. Usually, the noun for which it is the predicate is in the nom., as in native Akk.:⁵⁵⁰ e.g., pilku yānu ina eqli annī 3:122:18f. Occasionally however, the noun is in the acc.,^{550a} as the "object" of yānu: e.g., pilka yānu ina eqli annī ša GN 3:128:17. Perhaps this reflects underlying WS influence,

⁵⁴⁹Written *ia-nu* in 3:82:25; 3:116:r9'; 3:122:18; 3:123:19; 3:125:r3'; 3:128:17,30; 3:129:7; 3:134:26; 3:142a:7; 3:146a:13; 3:152:r4'; 3:156:18; 3:159a:18; 6:45:25; *ia-a-nu* in 3:117:r10; 3:124:11,18; 3:136:22; 3:160a:25; 6:33:22; *i-ia-nu* in 3:126:25; *5:146:15.

⁵⁵⁰Cf. the examples in CAD I/J, 323; Aro, *Glossar*, 42.

^{550a}*yānu* is always construed with the acc. at Byblos; see Moran, "Byblos," 14f.; also, W.F. Albright and W.L. Moran, *JCS* 2 (1948), p. 248 (n. 28).

since particles and verbs of (non-)existence there regularly govern the acc.⁵⁵¹ Word order in clauses with *yānu* is discussed above, pp. 302f.

The vetitive does not occur in U.

6. The Particle *lū*

*lū*⁵⁵² is extremely rare in U. It occurs in only one of the legal texts, meaning "whether...or": *lū māru lū mārta[u ša] PN* "whether son or daughter of PN" 3:102:18.

In the letters, it occurs before the stative and in non-verbal clauses to express a will toward a state or condition (as in K; see above, p. 112); it occurs before the subject in *lū šulmu ana muhḫīka* "Health be to you" e.g., 4:294:5, and *ana muhḫi bēlṭya lū šulmu* e.g., *3:5:5f.; before the predicate with the stative: *u lū zakū* "that they be free (of claims)" *5:142:30.⁵⁵³ With a preformative stative, note: *lū lū ṭde* "that I may know" 5:88:36.

In the only other attestation of *lū*, it serves as an asseverative particle:⁵⁵⁴ *u lū ittami* "And indeed he swore"

⁵⁵¹Note Hebrew *ʾēnennî* "I am not," with the acc. 1s suffix, e.g., Exodus 8:17. Arabic *kāna* and its "sisters" also take the acc.; cf. Wright, *GAL* II, pp. 94f.

⁵⁵²Always written *lu-ū*.

⁵⁵³For *lu ga-mi-ir-mi* in *ibid.*:15, read probably *lugam-mir-mi* "let me finish"; see above, p. 233, and n. 252.

⁵⁵⁴Cf. *GAG* §81f. On *lu-ū-ma-[al-li]* in 5:7:5', see above, p. 233, n. 253. Note that asseverative *lū* does not occur in K.

*3:19:12f.⁵⁵⁵

Note that *lū* is never used to strengthen the negative in prohibitions, as often happens in K.

7. Non-Coordinating Enclitic -ma

In U, -ma occurs more often as an emphasizing particle than as a connector. Very often, it marks the logical predicate of a sentence:⁵⁵⁶ e.g., *ištēnšu PN abūšū-ma iddin-šunu* "First, it was PN his father who gave them" 3:97:7f.;⁵⁵⁷ *aššum dīnīšū-ma nadin nidnuš* "It was because of his judgment that his gift was given" 3:68:11f.; *u pilku ina eqli šuwāti yānu pilkā(m)-ma mur'ū rābiši uppal* "There is no feudal service in this field; it is for the service of the m.-officials that he will be responsible" 3:146:13f.; cf. 3:116:r9'f.; 6:33:21ff.⁵⁵⁸ In these last three texts, -ma is strangely placed on the nomen regens (always *pilku*), rather than on the genitive, which is the word that should be emphasized.

The same is true in 3:91:8'ff.: *u eqlēt GN₁ ša ultu dārīti ša*⁵⁵⁹ *ina qāti amīlī GN₂ ina qāti(m)-ma amīlī GN₂* "and the

⁵⁵⁵Note also, in a nominal clause: [u i]nanna anāku ana šarri šamši bešyū lū arđum(ĪR.MEŠ)-ma "And now, I am truly a servant to the king, the Sun, my lord" **EA47:10f.

⁵⁵⁶See above, p. 113, and n. 310.

⁵⁵⁷Cf. perhaps also]ŠEŠ-šu-ma[in 3:124:21.

⁵⁵⁸Cf. also 3:88:6; 3:92:18; 3:102:16; *5:112:14'. In 3:150:r5', the text is too badly broken to determine the function of -ma in *mannum-ma*.

⁵⁵⁹On the extra *ša*, see below, p. 335.

fields of GN₁, which always belonged to the men of GN₂, still belong to the men of GN₂"; cf. also 11.4'ff. This sentence must be compared with 3:88:2ff.: *RN...ittasī bīt marša't u iddinšu ana marša't-ma ana mārīšunu ana dārītī* "RN...took the house of the m.'s, and gave it to (those) very m.'s (and) to their sons, forever." Both of these texts are, as Nougayrol labels them, confirmations of traditional land-holdings. The *-ma* emphasizes the identity of the former and future tenants.⁵⁶⁰

In nominal clauses, the grammatical predicate is sometimes marked by *-ma*:⁵⁶¹ e.g., *inanna anāku ana šarri bēltyla lū arđum-ma* **EA47:13f.; *u kīšū-ma*⁵⁶² *šunū-ma* "and they (will be treated) similarly" 5:10:23. In the latter passage, the adverb is the predicate; *-ma* on the subject is presumably for emphasis. Note also *ana x akannā-ma* "(It is) likewise for X" 3:181:p.(Ec.).

Sometimes it is not as obvious that the particle marks its word as the logical predicate. Nevertheless, as in *šunū-ma*, just cited, it still denotes emphasis. This is especially true with adverbs and adverbial expressions:⁵⁶³ e.g., *ana šarri bēlīšu anih danniš danniš-ma* "He is very,

⁵⁶⁰Cf. GAG §123a(β).

⁵⁶¹Cf. GAG §123a(γ).

⁵⁶²This word is always followed by *-ma*; cf. CAD K, 465a.

⁵⁶³There is probably no special emphasis in the unique example *ištu ūmi annīm-ma* Syl8:249:1 (vs. scores of examples without *-ma*).

very loyal to the king his lord" 3:141:29f.; *u idd[inšu].ana PN...ana dārītīm-ma* "And he gave it to PN...forever" 3:50a:7ff., cf. 14; 3:48a:9 (but compare the much more frequent *ana dārītī*, e.g., 3:51:19).⁵⁶⁴

Even on verbs, *-ma* is usually not a connector (see below): e.g., *u amīl GN l[ē]l[ē]-ma* (end of letter) "And let PN come up" *5:137:9f.; *šarru ana PN ittadinšunū-ma ana dāri dūri ana mārīšu mamma lā...ilaqqēšu* "The king gave them to PN forever, (and) to his sons. No one...may take them(lit.: it)" 3:90a:9ff.⁵⁶⁵ Also, when *-ma* and *u* both occur, it is unlikely that *-ma* acts as a conjunction; examples are given in the next section. As in K,⁵⁶⁶ the purpose of the particle in all these cases, unless it is simply to emphasize the verb, an unlikelihood, is not clear. It is possible that it reflects the Ugaritic enclitic *m* in some instances, but the function of that particle is also not well understood as yet.⁵⁶⁷ The same possibility may apply to a few occurrences of *-ma* on the other parts of speech, when no particular emphasis seems to be intended: e.g., *šanīta*.

⁵⁶⁴Cf. also EA45:15 (vs. 1.23); **EA46:5; 3:83:28; 3:102:12; 3:167:15; 5:10:24; 6:28:9

⁵⁶⁵Cf. 3:101f:11f., where *ilaqqēšū-m[a]* is followed by *appūnā-ma*, which almost certainly begins a new sentence; and 6:32:14, where *uppāl-ma* is in a subordinate clause, and is followed by the main clause. It is also doubtful that *-ma* in *qibī-ma* in letter introductions, p., was considered a conjunction by U scribes.

⁵⁶⁶4:157:42ff., 4:193:13ff., quoted above, p. 115.

⁵⁶⁷UT §11.4-8, pp. 103f.

bit maškani (KI.LÁH.MEŠ) : *hē-ya-ma*⁵⁶⁸ ša *PN*₁...*ana PN*₂
iddinšu "Moreover he gave *PN*₂ the lot of *PN*₁" 3:103:15f.

In the formula *umma PN(-ma)* "thus (speaks) *PN*," which identifies the sender of a letter, *-ma* always occurs in native Bab. texts.⁵⁶⁹ But in U, it appears only four times in the 12 letters whose introductions are preserved.⁵⁷⁰ There is no apparent reason or pattern to the occurrence or lack of the particle in this circumstance. Perhaps, not understanding its function, or its origin,⁵⁷¹ the scribes simply forgot it most of the time.

Finally, in several instances, what appears to be the particle *-ma* is more likely part of the Ugaritic pl. morpheme; these are listed above, pp. 216f.

8. Coordination of Clauses

a. Coordination with *-ma*.⁵⁷²

-ma is extremely rare as a conjunction in U. The only relatively certain examples of this use of the particle are:

⁵⁶⁸In three other texts, this word, which is probably Ugaritic, occurs without *-ma*: 3:87:r7',9'; 3:95:6; 3:123:6,11.

⁵⁶⁹Cf. Salonen, *Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln*, 57f. for MB, and 16 for OB.

⁵⁷⁰With *-ma*: EA49:2; 5:87:4; 5:97:3; *5:137:3, but not l.11; also without *-ma*: 3:4:3; *3:19:1; 4:294:1f.; *5:141:1; *5:145f.;1,20; 5:147:1; *6:2:3; *6:11:1.

⁵⁷¹Cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 100ff.

⁵⁷²All the occurrences of *-ma* in U not covered in the previous section are cited in this one, except for the common *qibṭ-ma* in letter introductions.

iššē-ma šarru RN tuppa ana PN...ittadin "RN the king took and gave a tablet to PN..." 3:72:10ff.; *ubru [an]a bītīšu ul errub-ma alapšu imēršu...u gabbu mimmušu ana ekalli ul errub-ma iššē-ma šarru bīt PN₁...u ittadinšu ana PN₂* "The u.-official may not enter his house, and neither his ox, his ass..., nor anything of his will enter the palace; and the king took the estate of PN₁...and gave it to PN₂" 3:141:20ff. (In contrast to this text, however, note: *ubru ana bītīšu lā irrub ina mārī šipru šarri lā illak hapīru ana bītīšu lā irrub* 3:105:53ff.; here the context and grammar are very similar, yet *-ma* does not occur.) If *-ma* is in fact a conjunction in these examples, there are too few of them to discover its special nuances, or the restrictions on its occurrence. Note, however, that in 3:141:20ff., the clauses are reversible, a condition which precludes the use of *-ma* in OB (and in K).⁵⁷³

-ma is also found a few times on the predicate of the first of two clauses connected by *u*. It was noted above (p. 126), that *-ma u* occurs sporadically in OB with the meaning "and also"; *-ma* and *u* thus form a double conjunction, and both contribute to its special meaning. The sole instance of *-ma u* in K also fits this description. But we have just seen that in U, *-ma* is very rare as a conjunction, and, earlier (section 7, above), that it more often occurs

⁵⁷³For the notion of "reversibility," and for references, see above, pp. 117ff.

on verbs without having that function. Thus, it should probably also not be considered a conjunction, or part of one, when it occurs with *u*. The examples bear this out, as the following parallel passages illustrate: *u nahlaptāšu išakkan-ma ana sikkūri* (GIŠ SAG.KUL) *u ipaṭṭar ana sūqi* "And he will place his cloak on the door-bolt and depart into the street" Sy18:249:22f.; but without *-ma*: *u nahlaptāšu ana* GIŠ *sū-qi-ri išakkan u itte(ṣ)ṣi ana sūqi* 5:177:8ff. Note also *iššī-ma...u ittadinšu* 3:141:20ff. (quoted in full above), and compare the ubiquitous examples of *ittāši...u ittadin(šu)*, e.g., 3:52:3ff.⁵⁷⁴

b. Coordination with *u*.

The normal particle for connecting clauses is *u*. It connects both reversible and irreversible sequences, as in native Akk.⁵⁷⁵ For the former type, note, e.g., *gabbu ṣābī ...-ya ina GN₁ ašbū u gabbu eleppētūya ina GN₂ ašbū* "All my ...-troops are stationed in GN₁, and all my ships are stationed in GN₂" 5:87:20ff. An example of the latter is the common formula *RN...ittāši X u iddin/ittadin(šu(nu)) ana PN* "RN...took X, and gave it(them) to PN" e.g., 3:85:2ff.,

⁵⁷⁴Other examples are 3:54a:5ff.; 3:141:20; and probably EA45:18,25; *6:3:28. In one other instance, *-ma* seems curiously to emphasize a contrast or alternative: *hašhat FN u ana PN₁ tanaddīnšu hašhat-ma u ana mārī PN₂ tanaddīnšu ana šakni bītša tanaddīnšu* "If FN wishes, she may give it to PN₁; or, if she wishes, she may give it to PN₂'s children, (or) she may give it to her major-domo."

⁵⁷⁵Again, for the terminology used here, and for references, see above, 117ff.

and p.

As in K (see above, pp. 122ff.), many of the occurrences of *u* are non-Akk. Thus, e.g., it connects clauses, the verbs of which are of different moods:⁵⁷⁶ e.g., *bēl(ṭ)-dīnāti ina qāti PN attadinšunu ana m[uhhū bēlīya] ileqqāššunūti u bē-l(u)ya PN kī damqi kī ṭābi ana panī šarrīšu qarr[ib]šu* "I have given these legal opponents to PN to take to my lord, and, my lord, present PN well and properly to his king" *3:5:22ff. Further, there are long strings of clauses connected with *u*: e.g., *RN...ittāši...u iddinšu...u ipṭuršu...u iš-kunšu...u...iškun* "RN...took...and gave it...and removed him ...and placed him...and placed..." 3:78:2ff. *u* is also often used to introduce new paragraphs; some examples are 5:98:r8', 13'; 3:84:25. Finally, in about half the examples of subordinate clauses, *u* connects them to the main clause: e.g., *enūma kī ušebbal šarru bēl(u)ya sisī...u hataddi aradka* "Whenever the king my lord sends/would send horses...your servant rejoices/would rejoice" 5:98:10ff.⁵⁷⁷ similarly, *u* connects protasis and apodosis in about one third of the conditional sentences: e.g., *šumma...FN lā tamang[ur]...u kasap terhatīša inandin* "If...FN does not agree..., he will give (her) the silver of her bride price" 3:60b:10ff.⁵⁷⁸

⁵⁷⁶See Patterson, "Parataxis," 32f., 42f., 50f., 73f.

⁵⁷⁷Cf. also *3:19:5; 3:68:7ff.; 3:110a:5ff. On subordinate clauses in general, see below, pp. 335ff.

⁵⁷⁸Cf. also 3:55f.:18ff.; 3:76a:4ff.; 3:110a:9ff.; 3:114:17ff.; 5:10:21ff. On conditional sentences, see pp. 330ff.

The probable WS origin of these various uses of *u* was discussed above (pp. 120ff.), in connection with the K texts. In addition to those observations, the mere fact of the pervasive, almost exclusive, use of *u* to connect clauses argues that coordination in general in U was according to WS rather than Akk. grammar.

c. Coordination with *-ma u*.

There are probably no instances of both *-ma* and *u* serving as conjunctions together. When both appear, it is unlikely that *-ma* is to be considered a conjunction. See above under *-ma* (section a), and *u* (section b).

d. Coordination with *ū*.

There are few certain examples of this conjunction, since, as in K, it is written the same as *u* "and" (i.e., *ū*). One example is: *mannum-mē ina libbīšunu ša izziz ina dīni itti FN ū ša uqallil FN ummašunu* "Whichever of them would stand in court against (lit.: with) FN, or would treat FN their mother disrespectfully" *Syl8:249f.:16ff.* Most other possible instances of *ū* involve alternative hypothetical conditions: e.g., *šumma...PN₁ iše''er PN₂ māršu...ū/u šumma PN₂ PN₁ abāšu iše''er...* "If...PN₁ rejects PN₂ as his son, ...; or/and/but if PN₂ rejects PN₁ as his father..." 3:55: 7ff.; cf. 3:114:13ff. Naturally, by the very nature of *ū*, the clauses it connects are fully reversible.

e. Asyndetic Coordination.

As elsewhere, most sequences of clauses connected by a conjunction (in U, almost always *u*) can be paralleled by other sequences where no conjunction appears.⁵⁷⁹ In OB (and in K, see above, pp. 128f.), the only sequences excluded from this generalization are those in which the verbs are of different moods. This is probably true in U as well, although it is often difficult to determine whether two clauses are semantically connected, or whether in fact the second begins a new thought, and so a new sentence.

As a clear example of an asyndetically joined clause, note: *inanna anumma 1600 šiltāha erī ina qāti PN atta[di]n ana muhhi šarri bēlīya ileqqāššunūti* "Now then I hereby give 1600 copper arrowheads to PN to take to the king my lord" *3:5:12ff., cf. 21ff.

9. Subordination

a. Conditional Sentences.

The only certain unmarked conditional sentence is a double one: *urram šēram hašhat FN u ana PN₁ tanaddiṣu hašhat-ma u ana mārī PN₂ tanaddiṣu ana šakni bītša tanaddiṣu* "In future, if FN wishes, she may give it to PN₁; (or) if she wishes, she may give it to the children of PN₂; (or) she may give it to her major-domo(?)" 3:53:10ff.

In all other conditional sentences, the protasis is introduced by *šumma*. There are two instances in which the

⁵⁷⁹Cf. Patterson, "Parataxis," 161.

protasis consists of more than one clause. In one, both are begun by *šumma*: *u šumma urram šēram mannum-mē ša šarrutta ...eppaš u šumma [mann]um-ma(?) ušamraṣūšunūti [u](?) illa-kūn[im-m]a ana muhhi bēlīya* "An if in future there is someone who exercises kingship..., and if someone(?) causes them trouble, they may come to my lord" *6:3:24ff. The other example has three clauses in the protasis, but only the first and third have *šumma*: *šanīta šumma PN₁ imāt(BA.UG₇) u FN [ašš]atšu ištu bītīša l[ā] uṣṣi šumma PN₂ l[ā]ze'erša u 80 kaspā...talaqqe* "Moreover if PN₁ dies, and FN his wife does not want to leave her house, and (lit.: if) PN₂ rejects her, she will take the 80 silver..." 3:55:15ff. There are no cases in which *šumma* is repeated within one clause.

In about one third of the examples, the apodosis is introduced by *u*, presumably due to WS influence.⁵⁸⁰ As in K, some texts have apodoses both with and without *u*, e.g., 3:55:7ff., 11ff. (both without *u*), but 18ff. (with *u*).

The protasis may be a nominal clause, as in *u šumma urram šēram mannum-mē ša šarrutta...eppaš* "if in future there is someone who exercises kingship..." *6:3:24f. In

⁵⁸⁰See above, pp. 328f. For the "waw of apodosis" in Ugaritic, note, e.g., *w . hm . ḫt . / ol . w . likt / omk . w . hm / l . ol . w . lakm / ilāk* "And if the Hittites come up, I will send a message to you; and (even) if the do not come up, I will certainly send a message to you" *UT* 1013:16ff., p. 218. In general, cf. S.B. Parker, "Studies in the Grammar of the Ugaritic Prose Texts" (Ph. D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967), §3.22. For other WS dialects, and "u of apodosis" elsewhere, see above, p. 124, n. 344.

two instances, the stative occurs: *šumma urra šēra anāku mītāku* "if in future I should die" 3:76a:7f.; the other is the unmarked condition in 3:53:10ff., quoted in the first paragraph of this section. The apodosis is frequently a nominal clause: e.g., *šumma innabbittū 100 kaspu elīšunu* "If they flee, they owe 100 silver" 3:37b:9f.

Most often, both the protasis and the apodosis contain finientic verbs. The condition being conjectured is always in the future, very often emphasized by the adverb phrase *urra(m) šēra(m)* "in future." There are no examples in which the action would have taken place in the past, as in 3:8:28ff. in K (see above, pp. 132f.). The tense in the protasis in U is thus normally the dur., as in K, again in contradistinction to native Akk. usage at this time.⁵⁸¹ There are some exceptions, however; see below, pp. 345ff., where the use of the tenses in U is discussed in detail. The tense in the apodosis is also usually the dur., although sometimes the prec. or imper. is used, correctly, and sometimes the pret. occurs, incorrectly; again, see below, 345ff., for examples and further discussion.

In the three protases with a negative, *lā* is used.⁵⁸²

b. Relative Clauses.

One relative clause is introduced by the general rela-

⁵⁸¹See above, p. 131, nn. 364-7, for references.

⁵⁸²3:55:15ff., 3:60b:10ff.; *5:142:19f. The examples are quoted above, p. 320.

tive *mannum-mê*:⁵⁸³ *DN liqqur [mannu]m-mê ištu awāte [annāt]i inakkir* "May DN destroy whoever disputes these words" 3:108:19f.⁵⁸⁴

All other relative clauses are introduced by *ša*. Quite often, the determinative pronoun has no antecedent. In such cases, the relative clause may serve as the subject of its sentence, as in *ša dīna iṣabbat X kaspa...iddin* "Whoever starts a legal case must pay X silver..." 3:92:14ff.; or as the direct object, as in *ša ušbalkit nidna annā DN liš'alšu* "May DN hold responsible (lit.: ask) whoever overturns this gift" 3:84:25ff. Such clauses are not attested as any other part of speech in the main clause.⁵⁸⁵

More commonly, *ša* has an antecedent, either a noun or a pronoun. In these cases, the relative clause modifies its antecedent, following it (and its other modifiers) immediately: e.g., *rābiṣu ša uštēṣi kunuk šarri* "the prefect who brought out the royal seal" 3:169:25f.

Relative clauses may be verbal, as in the examples already quoted, or nominal as in 2 *bītāt PN₁ ša [ina] panānu*

⁵⁸³On the subjunctive in U, see above, pp. 242f. For *mannum-mê*, see AHw, 603b (2a).

⁵⁸⁴The interpretation of this passage offered here is discussed above, pp. 205f., and n. 144.

⁵⁸⁵When such a clause would in effect be a genitive dependent on a noun, it is topicalized as a *casus pendens*, and resumed by a pronominal suffix; cf. GAG §165k. An example in U is: *ša tuppu annām unakkir ilānu šumšu lihaliq* "May the gods destroy the name of whoever alters this tablet" 3:105:56f. (for **ilānu šum(a ša) ša...unakkir lihaliq(ū)*).

ana PN₂ "PN₁'s 2 estates, which formerly (belonged) to PN₂" 3:103:13. Such nominal relative clauses are especially common in the descriptions of the various plots of land that are the concern of so many of the legal texts: e.g., *eqla ša ina eqel GN* "the field which (is) in the field of GN" 3:143f.:19; etc. More often in such situations, however, *ša* does not appear, so that in effect an adverbial (prepositional) phrase modifies a noun, a situation which never occurs in K.⁵⁸⁶ A few examples are: *kirā ina eqel āli* "the orchard in the town field" *ibid.*:6f.; *bīta eqla ša PN šatammī ina GN* "the estate (and) field of PN the steward in GN" 3:81:4f.; *u eqel PN ammaka* "the field of PN there" 3:48:15f.; etc. There is no apparent difference in nuance whether *ša* is used or not.

The determinative pronoun may be the subject of its clause: e.g., *ša ilaqqe bītu...ištu qāti PN* "whoever takes the estate...from PN" 3:52a:17ff.; or the direct object: *ana mārī ša tullad* "to the sons whom she will bear" 5:5:6'. When it is the object, it is only once resumed by a suffix on the verb: *bīta šanā ša rābiṣu ittadinšu*⁵⁸⁷ "another estate which the prefect gave" 3:90b:10f. There are no examples in which *ša* represents any other part of speech in its

⁵⁸⁶See above, pp. 136f., and n. 382.

⁵⁸⁷The suffix could also be dat., referring to the PN in 1.4 to whom the property was given: "...which the prefect gave him." However, it was noted above (p. 199), that dat. suffixes are not common in U.

clause.

In no example in these texts does *ša* govern more than one clause. If more than one relative clause modifies a single antecedent, *ša* is repeated: *minum-mē ša ibašši ana yāšši ša tarteši FN* "All that I have, that FN acquired" *Syl8: 249:4ff.*; cf. *ibid.:16ff.*, quoted above, p. 329.

In a very few instances, *ša* is repeated without purpose later in the relative clause:⁵⁸⁸ e.g., *u ša FN mārāt PN aššat(a)ya ištu ahīya ša ihuzši* "and whoever takes (in marriage) FN, the daughter of PN, my wife, from my brother" *3:76a:6ff.*; in a non-verbal clause: *u eqlēt GN₁ ša ultu dārīti ša ina qāti amīlī GN₂* "the fields of GN₁ which have always been in the hands of the men of GN₂" *3:91a:8'ff.* The reason for the extra *ša* is not known.

No negatives occur in any of the relative clauses.

The main clause is never continued by *u* after a relative clause, as happens occasionally at Nuzi.⁵⁸⁹

c. Other Subordinate Clauses.⁵⁹⁰

As in K (above, pp. 138ff.), there are very few other subordinate clauses, especially considering the number of

⁵⁸⁸This phenomenon is often encountered at Nuzi; cf. Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*, pp. 82f. Note especially his last two examples, in which the relative clause modifies the subject of the main clause: *mannu/mannum-mē ša ina libbīšunu ša ašbu še'a ana PN umalla* "Whoever lives among them will pay the grain to PN" *HSS 9:74:13f.*; *9:69:13ff.*

⁵⁸⁹Cf. Wilhelm, *Hurro-Akkadisch*, pp. 54, 82f.

⁵⁹⁰On the subjunctive in U, see above, pp. 242f.

texts in the corpus. In all but two instances, the subordinate clause precedes the main clause. The exceptions are noun clauses, both introduced by *kī*, and both in questions.⁵⁹¹

One acts as object of the verb "to know": *abūya ul ī[d]e kī gabbu šābū ...-ya ina GN₁ ašbū u gabbu eleppētūya ina GN₂ ašbū*⁵⁹² "Does my father not know that all my ...-troops are

stationed in GN₁ and all my ships in GN₂?" 5:87:19ff.; the other is subject of an impersonal predicative verbal adjective: *bani akanna ina pa<nī>ka kī yānu karānū...* "Does it seem right to you this way, that there are no vineyards..."

*5:146:12ff.⁵⁹³ These are the only noun clauses attested.

When the main clause follows the subordinate, it does so immediately nine times,⁵⁹⁴ but is introduced by *u*⁵⁹⁵ in four other instances.⁵⁹⁶

There are two comparative clauses, both begun by *kīma*:

⁵⁹¹Noun clauses serving as objects of certain verbs regularly follow the main clause in MB; cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 154; *GAG* §177c. Note that *kī* is used there as well.

⁵⁹²*kī* governs two clauses here.

⁵⁹³No examples of *bani kī* "it is good that" are listed in *CAD* B, 81ff., only *bani ša* (NA, NB; p. 83: 4'). *banū* begins to replace *damqu* in MB (*ibid.*, 83b). In Byblos, note *damiq inūma* (for *kī*) *iqbat GN* "Is it right that he seize GN?" *EA*84:36; cf. Moran, "Byblos," 67ff. For *undu...šamit* 3:72a: 9ff., see below, and n. 600.

⁵⁹⁴Seven times, if *enūma* is an adverb rather than a conjunction (see below).

⁵⁹⁵See above, p. 328.

⁵⁹⁶Three times, if *enūma* is an adverb rather than a conjunction (see below).

kīma [DN] *sakāt* *sakī* "As DN is pure, he is 'pure' (i.e., free of claims)" 3:107:5f.; cf. *kīma* DN *sakki*⁵⁹⁷ [u] (?) *sakāt* FN 3:110a:5f. *kīma* is not used for any other type of clause.⁵⁹⁸

Two temporal clauses begin with *adi*: *šanīta* [ad]i *pilka šāš*[u]...PN *uppal-ma*⁵⁹⁹ *mamman lā ilaqqēšu*... "Moreover as long as PN is responsible for that feudal service..., no one may take it..." 6:32:12ff.; *u lū ittami adi lā iddin-mi ardīka kasap ip̄terīšunu ana yāšī* "And he swore, as long as he has not given your servants, the silver for their ransom (will remain) with me" *3:19:12ff.

The word *undu* occurs three times. As in K (pp. 139f.), it is more likely a conjunction than an introductory adverb, although the latter possibility cannot be ruled out. In two instances, it would be a temporal conjunction: *undu taltapra u taqtebi mā*... "When you wrote me, you said...(long quote)" *3:19:5ff.; *undu PN₁...PN₂...u [PN₃] hiṭṭa rabā itep[šū]* *kunukka meher kunuk šarri rab itepšū* "When PN₁..., PN₂...,

⁵⁹⁷On the agreement (the stative should be f.), see above, n. 529, pp. 313f. This could be a prepositional phrase, "like pure DN," as is most often the case in this formula; cf. *kīma* DN *sakīti/sakāti* 3:57:17; 3:66a:3f.; 3:111b:10f.; 5:15:r2',8'. However, since a comparative clause is possible, as demonstrated by 3:107:5f., the writing *sa-ak-ki*, without the extra vowel sign (for *sak(k)ī*), argues that the form is in the predicative state.

⁵⁹⁸In MB, *kī* is used for comparative clauses; cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 154. In fact, *kīma* is only very rarely attested in MB (cf. *ibid.*, 149, 153f.), while it is the normal form in OB (*GAG* §178a).

⁵⁹⁹See above, pp. 324f., for *-ma*.

and PN₃ committed a great crime, they made a seal, a copy of the great royal seal" 3:97:13ff. The other example is more difficult, but it seems likely that a causal clause is intended: *undu eqlu šamit iššē-ma RN šarru tuppa PN... ittadin* "Since the field is transferred, RN the king took and gave a tablet to PN..."⁶⁰⁰ 3:72a:9ff. (If *undu* is instead an adverb, the passages would mean, respectively: "Now then, you wrote and said:..."; "Now then,...committed a great crime: (namely,) they made a seal..."; and "Now then, the field is transferred. RN the king...")

It was shown above (pp. 140f.), that *enūma* is probably an adverb in K. The evidence in U is less clear, and it remains equally possible that it is a conjunction. The examples are: *inūma nakir PN₁ tupšarru itti šarri bēlīšu u PN₂ idūkšu* "When(Now then,) PN₁ the scribe was at war with the king his lord, (but) PN₂ killed him" 3:68:7ff.; *bēlī enūma iltapra šarru bēl(u)ya ana muhhi ardīka mā...inanna anumma...atta[din]* "My lord, since(now then,) the king my lord has written to his servant: '...',(.) I hereby now give..." *3:5:9ff.; *enūma zēr hurati šabūtuya zēr hurhurati šūbilanni* "Since(Now then,) h.-seed is my desire,(;) send me h.-seed" *6:12a:7ff.⁶⁰¹ The same ambiguity is present

⁶⁰⁰The translation in CAD S, 94a, "that the field had been transferred," is due to a misdivision of sentences, taking the *undu*-clause with the previous sentence. It is improbable that *undu* ever means "that" as CAD has it.

⁶⁰¹The clauses *enūma it-ya šulmu* (twice) and *enūma atta...lā tīde* in *5:145f.:6,24,9f., respectively, are of no

in the following example: *bēlī enūma kī ušebbal šarru*
bēl(u)ya sisī...u hataddi aradka "My lord, (now then) when-
 ever the king my lord sends/would send horses..., you ser-
 vant rejoices/would rejoice" 5:98:10ff. It cannot be deter-
 mined whether *enūma* here forms a compound conjunction with
kī,⁶⁰² or whether it is simply an adverb.

The subordinate clause in the following is probably
 causal, but the restorations are by no means certain: *kīmē*
*[šarru(?)] ištu [GN(?)] illa[k...]*⁶⁰³ *šupra[m-mi/a] dīna*
 "Since the king(?) is going out of GN(?), send me the case"
 *5:141:10ff. This is the only occurrence of *kīmē* as a con-
 junction in U.⁶⁰⁴


The conjunction *kī* occurs three times, in addition to
 the two examples quoted above; one is in a damaged text, and
 the exact meaning of *kī* cannot be determined: *abūya anu[mmla*
*kī altapa[r*⁶⁰⁵...] "My father, now then, since/when(?) I
 wrote..." 5:81:9'. The other two are both of the form:

help due to this scribes extremely poor knowledge of Akk.
 See above, p. 165, and n. 3.

⁶⁰²I know of no other such compounds, except with *ša*.

⁶⁰³If the other restorations, which are Nougayrol's,
 are correct, the verb expected here is (*w*)*aṣū*, not *alāku*.

⁶⁰⁴It occurs as a preposition in 3:111b:10.

⁶⁰⁵Nougayrol, followed by Berger (*UF* 2, 285), reads
il_x-ta-p[ār(?)]. Since the context is so broken, and quite
 unintelligible, I do not understand the insistence, despite
 having to read *il_x*, on a 3ms verb. In the copy, *pā[r]*
 looks fairly certain: .

aššum X *kī* + verb.⁶⁰⁶ Normally in MB, when *kī* is immediately before the verb, it indicates a temporal clause (past tense).⁶⁰⁷ However, in both of our examples, the context makes a causal clause more likely. Thus, each of the *aššum*-phrases must be a *casus pendens*. The passages are: *bēlī aššum dīni ša PN kī tašpura ana muhhi [ardīka] inanna...al-takan* "My lord, concerning the case of PN--because you wrote to your servant, I have now placed..." 3:4:9ff.; *aššum alpīya ša iltarqū amīlū GN kī taqtab[i] mā...anumma dīna šāš[u] gummir* "Concerning my oxen which the men of GN stole--because you wrote (saying): '...', now complete that case" *5:14lf.: 7ff. Note that both *kī* and *kīmē* (see above) occur in *5:14lf., with the meaning "since, because." These last two subordinate clauses, with *kī*, are peculiar in that, in K, they would be relative clauses with *ša*: e.g., *aššum dīni ša hapīrī ša tašpura* "concerning the case of the Hapiru, about which you wrote" 3:3:5f.; cf. also 3:6b:7f.; 5:94f.:5ff, 40ff.

As the examples show, punctive action in the past (or so perceived, as in *adi...lā iddin*), may be expressed in the subordinate clause by either the pret. or the perf. The dur. is used for habitual, durative, or future action. The stative, of course, expresses no tense or aspect.

⁶⁰⁶There is also *kī uqabbi* 3:157a:19', which Nougayrol translates: "comme elle(?) (l')avait promis(?)." However, the text is badly damaged, and the context is not at all clear. *kī* could mean "since" or "when" just as readily. It is also possible that the verb should be read *ukabbi*[t].

⁶⁰⁷Cf. Aro, *SMBG*, 147f.

The only occurrence of a negative in a subordinate clause is *lā* in *3:19:13.

10. The Use of the Tenses

a. Preterite and Perfect.

Generally, these two forms are almost completely interchangeable, although one or the other tends to be preferred in certain circumstances, or with certain verbs. Thus, in the letters, the perf. never occurs after a negative; the only examples are: *ul ik-šu-da-ni* "they have not reached me" 5:87:24; *u bēl(u)ya lā iš-al-šu* "but my lord did not ask him" **EA47:13(probably after a perf.: [*aš-ta-p]ár*); [*lā*⁷ *ta-āš-pur* "you did not send" *ibid.*:20. But in the only example of a negative with a past tense in a legal text, the perf. is used: *šarru lā id-du-uk-šu-nu-t[i]*⁶⁰⁸ "the king did not kill them" 3:97:22. Some verbs occur only in the pret. for past tense: e.g., *pašāru* (11 times⁶⁰⁹), *sukku* (14 times⁶¹⁰); others, only in the perf.: e.g., *qabû* (five times⁶¹¹), *ḡabātu* (five times⁶¹²). But most verbs occur in

⁶⁰⁸On the reading, see above, p. 199, n. 121.

⁶⁰⁹3:35b:4; 3:113:5; 3:127f.:5,20; 3:143a:4,11; 5:8:5; 5:179:4; 5:263a:6; 5:263b:4; RA38:5:3.

⁶¹⁰The form is always written *û-sa-(ak-)ki*, never with *us*; thus, it is unlikely that it is a perf. The examples are: 3:32:3; 3:60a:13; 3:110a:4,8; 3:111:9; 3:112b:12; 3:140:4; 3:153f.:13,15,17; 5:15:r7',10'; 6:45:28; in 3:170b:13, the form is *û-se-ku-û*.

⁶¹¹*3:19:5; 3:76a:3; 3:170b:7; 5:112:10'; *5:141:9.

⁶¹²3:37a:4,11; 3:71b:5; 5:111f.:B4',13'.

both: e.g., *šakānu*,⁶¹³ *šapāru*,⁶¹⁴ *paṭāru*,⁶¹⁵ *nadānu*,⁶¹⁶ *našū*,⁶¹⁷ *šūrubu*,⁶¹⁸ etc.

Another tendency is for the first verb in legal documents, after the opening phrase(s) *ištu ūmi annī(m) (ana panī RN/šībūti)* "From this day (in the presence of RN/witnesses)," to be a perf.: e.g., with *našū* (overwhelmingly⁶¹⁹), *nadānu* (usually⁶²⁰), *leqū* (always⁶²¹). However, this "tendency" may be superficial only, for the three verbs just mentioned comprise over ninety per cent of the examples of this circumstance; when they are eliminated, perf. and pret. occur as the first verb almost equally. For example, other perf.'s are *paṭāru* (6:44:5; Syl8:251:4), *qabū* (3:76a:3; 5:176:3), *šabātu* (3:37a:4,11; 3:71b:5). But other introductory verbs are pret.: *pašāru* (nine times⁶²²), *sukku* (six times⁶²³),

⁶¹³Pret.: 3:78:10,13; 3:162b:5; perf.: 3:4:13; 3:134:11; 3:140:5.

⁶¹⁴Pret.: 3:4:10; EA45:25; **EA47:20; perf.: *3:5:9; *3:19:5; 4:294:11; 5:98:r2'; *6:12:16.

⁶¹⁵Pret.: 3:78:8; perf.: 3:83:27; 6:44:5.

⁶¹⁶Pret.: 3:48a:6; 3:49b:8; and p.; perf.: 3:142a:6; 3:142b:10; and p.

⁶¹⁷Pret.: 3:46:7; 3:49a:12; 3:72:10; 3:92:4; 3:140f.: 8,25(?); perf.: 3:48a:4; 3:49b:3; and p.

⁶¹⁸Pret.: 5:173:6,11; perf.: 3:55:19; 3:64:10.

⁶¹⁹At least 50 times perf., vs. once pret. (3:92:4).

⁶²⁰At least 15 times perf., vs. two pret. (3:47a:4; 3:147b:4).

⁶²¹3:35a:4; 3:59b:5; 3:62:4; 3:87:5; 3:102:2; 3:130:3; 3:146a:5; 3:159b:6; 3:167:4; 5:9:4.

epēšu (3:45:6), *šāmu* (5:10:3), *wuššuru* (3:110b:4⁶²⁴), *nuk-kuru* (3:162b:4). The verb *rakāsu* even appears as a perf. in one text (3:55:5), and as a pret. in another (3:75a:5).

The pret. only rarely occurs after *anumma* or *inanna*,⁶²⁵ whereas the perf. frequently does.⁶²⁶

There is also a tendency, once one of the forms has been used, for the scribe to continue using it in subsequent clauses. Note, e.g., *u ipṭurēšu...u iškunšu...u...iškun* "and he released him...and placed him...and placed..." 3:78:8ff. (but the first verb, *l.4*, is *ittāši*);⁶²⁷ ...*talteqe u taptatar u anaku...[al]ttaḏnaššu* "she has taken...and departed, and I...have given...to him" 3:83:26ff.⁶²⁸ However, "sequences" of both pret....perf., and perf....pret. are also found, with no apparent difference in nuance; note: ...*šarru unakkeršu u iltakanšu*... "the king removed him...and placed him" 3:134:10f. (but *RN...[un]akker PN...u iškunšu* 3:162b:3ff.); *RN...ittāši...u iddinšu* "RN...took...and gave it" 3:

⁶²²See above, n. 609.

⁶²³3:32:3; 3:107a:4; 3:110a:4; 3:140:4; 5:181:4; *Syl*18:253:9.

⁶²⁴Reading *ū-wa-aš-šer_g*; cf. Moran, "Syrian Scribe," 150f.

⁶²⁵Only 3:103:14; 5:10:25f.; 5:11:4f.

⁶²⁶Cf. 3:4:11ff.; *3:5:12ff., 21ff.; 3:49b:15ff.; 3:125:r5'ff.; 3:137a:8f.; 3:170b:7'f.; 4:294:8ff.; 5:98:r17'ff.; *6:12:14ff.; 6:48:8'ff.

⁶²⁷Cf. also 3:162b:4ff.: *[un]akker...u iškunšu*.

⁶²⁸Cf. also 3:71f.:5ff.: *išṣabat...u iltē*; *3:19:5: *taltapra u taqtebi*.

49:2ff., and often. This last example is a formula found at the beginning of most of the many legal texts involving royal land-grants.⁶²⁹ In it there is one interesting development, which involves the use of the tenses: in the texts from the reigns of Niqmaddu II, Arhalba, and Niqmepa, *nadānu* in this formula occurs in both the pret. and the perf., the pret. being somewhat more frequent; but in the many texts of this type from the reign of Ammistamru II, the last great king of Ugarit, the pret. is found only rarely, the perf. having come to be used almost exclusively (*našū* in all reigns is almost always perf.⁶³⁰).⁶³¹

Finally, there are quite a number of clauses in which the pret., but only once the perf., is used where a dur. is

⁶²⁹See Jonas C. Greenfield, "*našū-nadānu* and its Congeners," in Maria de Jong Ellis, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of J.J. Finkelstein*, Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, *Memoirs*, 19 (1977), 87ff.

⁶³⁰See above, n. 619.

⁶³¹It must be pointed out that there are many texts in which the formula is repeated, e.g., in double or multiple grants, and others in which one or the other verb (especially *nadānu*) is repeated, in clauses that further clarify or specify the transaction. Other texts begin simply with *nadānu* ("From this day the king has given"), or some other verb (e.g., *leqū*). Therefore, to simplify and control the statistics somewhat, the following figures include only the occurrences of *nadānu* when it is the second verb in the text, after *našū*, i.e., when the text begins *ištu ūmi anni(m) RN ittaši X u iddin/ittadin(šu(nu)) and PN*. There are 59 texts in our sample; the occurrence of the pret. and perf. of *nadānu* is:

	<i>iddin</i>	<i>ittadin</i>
Niqmaddu II	11	6
Arhalba	3	2
Niqmepa	8	3
Ammistamru II	3	23.

expected. These will be discussed in detail below.

Apart from these observations, there appear to be no other conditions that determine the use of one form rather than the other. The examples cited above and in the notes bear abundant testimony to the fact that the pret. and perf. implied an identical range of tense and aspect to the U scribes, namely, punctual action in the past. Even in subordinate clauses, one finds both used indiscriminately, in contrast to native MB.⁶³² In relative clauses, note: *gabba mimmûšu ša iršû* "all her(!) property which she acquired" 3:110a:12f.; *bēta šanā ša rābiṣu ittadinšu* "another house which the prefect gave" 3:90b:10f. In other subordinate clauses: *kī tašpura* "since you wrote me" 3:4:10; *kī taq-tab[ī]* "since you said" *5:141:7ff. Conditional sentences are discussed below.

It was mentioned above that the pret. often occurs when the context demands a dur.⁶³³ The examples are found in

⁶³²In MB, the perf. only rarely occurs in subordinate clauses; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 81. In the U texts, the pret. occurs 12 times: 3:4:10; *3:19:14f.; 3:110a:13; 3:170b:13'; 5:173:11; 3:76a:8; 3:84:25; 3:105:56; 3:154:17f.; *Syl*8:249:16f., 18f., 24f. In the last 7, the pret. replaces an expected dur.; i.e., it is future (see below). The perf. occurs 12 times: *3:19:5, 10, 20f.; 3:55f.:19, 22; 3:90b:11; 3:157b:11; 3:169:25; 3:170b:8; *5:141:7, 9; 5:263b:6. In *6:12a:12, the text has *ša il-te-qē* (perf.), but Nougayrol suggests emending to N pret.: *ša il-le!-qē*, probably correctly; see above, p. 249. After *enūma*, the perf. occurs once (*3:5:9), the pret. not at all.

⁶³³Because of the defective writing of double consonants, it is often difficult to determine whether a pret. or dur. is intended. As examples, note: *la i-ši-ib* (probably from *ešēbu*, either *išēib* or *ēšib*) "may it not flourish" 3:76a:11,

several different types of clauses. First, the pret. occurs in relative clauses which clearly mean "whoever does X (in the future)": e.g., *ša tuppū annām ū-na-ke-er* "whoever alters this tablet" 3:105:56; *ša [dīn]a ū-na-mi-iš* "whoever brings suit" 3:154:14f.; cf. also 3:76a:6ff.; 3:84:25f.; Syl8:249f.:16f., 18f., 24f. These seven examples are in fact almost double the number of times the expected dur. occurs in this type of clause (3:54:16; 3:92:14; 3:52a:17ff.; *6:3:24ff.).

In the other types of clauses, the dur. is the normal form. In the second, the pret., with a negative, is used as a prohibitive: e.g., *akīl narkabti lā ū-ma-'-er eli PN* "The overseer of the chariotry may have no power over PN" 3:81:31ff.; *kussā lā ū-ra-bi* "May he not exalt (his) throne" 3:76a:10; *urram šēram mamman lā il-qè ištu qāti PN* "In future, no one may take (it) from PN" 3:63a:11ff.; cf. *lā il-[qè]* 3:135b:17.⁶³⁴

immediately after *la ū-ra-bi* (pret. for dur.); *ū-ul e-kim-šu* (*ekkimšu* or *ēkimšu*) "may not take it away" 3:67b:15; *it-te-qi* (probably Gt; see above, p. 244; dur. *itteqsi* or pret. *itteqi*) "he will go away" 5:177:10. Other forms can be either dur. or pret. because of the ambiguity of the vowel in certain signs: e.g., *la ū-še-RI-bu* (dur. *ušerrebū* or pret. *ušēribū*) "they may not send in" 3:84:23; or for other reasons: e.g., *i-zē-er* (dur. *ižēr* or *iše'-er*; pret. *ižēr*) "(if) he rejects" 3:55:12 (cf. *i-zē'-er* ll.8, 18). The references for further examples are cited below, p. 349, n. 645. In all these cases, the "expected" tense, i.e., the dur., is assumed to be written; but due to the not infrequent replacement of the dur. by the pret., this assumption may often be incorrect.

⁶³⁴With these two examples of *ilqe* must be compared the over 70 examples of this injunction ("no one may take") with the dur. *ila/eqqe*.

Thirdly, the pret. is also found occasionally in assertions in main clauses, alongside a verb or verbs in the dur., when the context is clearly future: *ša dīna iṣabbat 2000 kaspā 1000 hurāṣa ana qāti PN i-din*⁶³⁵ "whoever begins legal proceedings will give 2000 silver and 1000 gold to PN" 3:92:14ff.; *u [...] i-na-aš-ši [...]...100 kaspā ū-ma-al-[l]i ina qāti ahhīšu u...i-šak-kān [u] it-te-ši*⁶³⁶ *ana sūqi* "and he will bear(?)...and(?) will pay 100 silver to his brothers and will place...and will go away into the street" 5:176f.: 5ff.; cf. *Syl8:249:16ff.*⁶³⁷ Related to these are the instances of the pret. in the apodosis of future conditional sentences:⁶³⁸ *šumma urra šēra PN inammuš dīna itti ahhīšu 10 bilat kaspi i-din ana ahhīšu u i-tū-ur ana bīt abīšu* "If in future PN brings a case against his brother, he will give his brother 10 talents of silver and return to his father's house" 3:81:25ff.; *šumma^{ma} urram šēram PN i-tu-ur ana libbīšu [X] kaspā ū-ma-al-li ina qāti šarri* "If in future PN changes

⁶³⁵Perhaps *i-<na->din* should be read; cf. 3:68:3. However, scribal omissions are not common in U; and note future *i-din* again in 3:81:28, quoted below.

⁶³⁶This form is probably a Gt (of (w)aqū), either dur. (*itteṣṣi*) or pret. (*itteṣi*); see above, p. 244.

⁶³⁷Perhaps also *ū PN ū-ra-ṣi-ip-šu-nu ū ū-še-ši-ib-šu-nu* "and PN will repair and settle them" 3:125:11'ff. The context seems to require the future. The second verb could be dur. (*ušeššibšunu*), or another pret. (*ušeššibšunu*) used for the dur.; the first verb is pret.

⁶³⁸The tense of the apodosis is normally the dur., as seen, e.g., in 3:55:10,20; 3:60b:15(bis); 3:75a:11(bis); 3:107:13; *6:3:28. The prec. or imper. may also occur in the apodosis; see below.

his mind, he will pay X silver to the king" 5:179:7ff.; cf. ibid.:12ff.; 5:173:15ff.; 3:60:13ff. (*i-pu-ul* 1.17); perhaps also 5:6:10' (*tí-ir-hu-uš*); 6:53:r5'ff. (*ú-ma-ni* 1.8').

The conditional sentence in 5:179f.:7ff., just quoted, brings up one final clause type to be considered: the protasis. Discounting the verb *tāru* for the moment, the verb of the protasis is *dur.* 11 times,⁶³⁹ pret. once (*šumma PN i-mu-ut* "if PN dies" 5:5:7');⁶⁴⁰ and perf. once (*šumma PN tuppa šanā it-ta-ši* "if PN brings up another tablet" 5:11:10f.). However, in the 14 times that *tāru* occurs in a protasis, five of the instances must be construed as pret.,⁶⁴¹ and only two as *dur.*;⁶⁴² the other seven are pl., and could be either tense.⁶⁴³ Obviously then, apart from *tāru*, the

⁶³⁹3:55:8,17 (the clause in 16f. is still governed by *šumma* in 1.15), 18; 3:60b:12 (reading *ta-ma-an-g[ur]*; see above, p. 244, n. 301); 3:81:26; 3:107:11; 3:114:19; 5:88:34; *5:142:21; *6:3:27; and probably EA45:28: *šum-ma-mi tu-še-bā-[al]* "if you send."

⁶⁴⁰ Perhaps also 5:4:14': [*u(?) šumma(?)*] *PN i-mu-[ut]*. Note a parallel example with the stative: *šumma urra šēra anāku mītāku* "if in future I should die" 3:76a:4f.

⁶⁴¹3:33:12,15; 5:180:8; 6:53:r6'; *Syl* 18:252:22. Note also *i-tā-ur* "will return" in an apodosis, 3:81,29, quoted above.

⁶⁴² Both forms are problematic; one is: *i-tu-ir-ru-ni* (pl.) 6:39:13; this is the only case of a "broken spelling" of a vowel in U. The other form is [*i-tu*]-*ur-ra* 5:180:13. Since *i-tu-ur* occurs in 1.8, and since the text is badly damaged, it is possible that *ur-ra* (of *urra šēra*) stands here, although the text has *ur-ra-am* in 1.7.

⁶⁴³ *i-tu-ru-ni* 3:114:14; 3:170b:12'; 6:52a:r3'; *i-tu-ur-n[i]* 5:181:8; *i-tā-ur-ni* 5:10:17,22; *i-tār-ni* *Syl* 18:252:18; on these forms, see above, pp. 237f.

the dur. is the normal tense in the protasis.⁶⁴⁴ Thus, other forms in protases, which, because of the defective writing system, could be either dur. or pret., should also be considered dur.⁶⁴⁵ The form *i-mu-ut*, and the instances of *itūr*, should be grouped with the verbs in the previous paragraphs, as additional examples of the "incorrect" use of the pret. for the dur. *it-ta-ši* constitutes the only example of the perf. usurping the function of the dur.;⁶⁴⁶ it does not seem to convey any special nuance.

Apart from the first type (the general relative clause, "whoever does X"), the above pret. forms occur only sporadically. In none of the types of clauses is its use a hard and fast rule; rather, the examples in each type can be paralleled by other, usually more frequent, examples with the

⁶⁴⁴In OB, the verb of the protasis is often pret., sometimes perf. (GAG §161d-f); the dur. implies a will toward something (GAG §161i). In MB, the perf. is the usual tense, but again, the dur. can be used to imply a special (willful) mood; cf. Aro, *SMbG*, 144f. There is no obvious mood expressed by the dur. in the U examples; it is simply the normal tense for the protasis.

⁶⁴⁵*i-ze-er* 3:55:12; *i-ze-er* 3:75a:8,18; *Sy*28:174:13; (these could be pret. *izēr* or dur. *izēr* or *ize'er*; in favor of the dur. is *i-ze'-er* 3:55:8,18); *i-na-bi-it* 3:37a:7,17; *i-na-bi-tu* 3:37b:9 (for pret. *innabit(tū)*, or dur. *innabit(tū)*; cf. GAG §97 l).

⁶⁴⁶For *it-te-gi* "he will go away" see p. 244. In 3:65a:22, read perhaps [*ši-i(t) ta-līaq!?-qē*]; cf. 3:56:20. In *3:19:19, a prec. is expected, and so the verb should probably be emended to *lī!(UD)-te-er-mi*. Finally, in 3:137a:9ff., which reads *u inanna FN tirtaqip bīta annā*, Nougayrol translates: "Et maintenant, FN (re)construira cette maison." But there is no reason why the action could not already have taken place: "Now then, FN has repaired..."

dur., which is the expected form. Since they cannot be explained by normal Akk. grammar, we must conclude either (a) that the scribes did not know the difference between the pret. and the dur., or (b) that the use of the pret. is due to substrate influence. The first alternative is improbable, because the two forms are usually correctly used. The dur., e.g., never occurs when the pret. (or perf.) is expected, with one possible exception (see below, section b, end). The second alternative is more likely: each of the "incorrect" pret.'s could represent a Ugaritic *yqtl* form, e.g., *ilqe* in 3:63a:12 is for Ugaritic **yilqaḥ*. But there is a problem here too: the correspondence (without the initial *y-* in the Akk.⁶⁴⁷) fits only the examples where the pret. is used for a prohibition, where Ugaritic indeed has **yaqtul*.⁶⁴⁸ For the other examples, Ugaritic would probably have **yaqtulu*,⁶⁴⁹ and so we might expect a final *-u* in the forms.⁶⁵⁰ Yet, none of them have it.⁶⁵¹ We are thus left with the rather diffi-

⁶⁴⁷Unlike many of the verbs in the "West-Semitizing" texts from El-Amarna; cf. Böhl, *Sprache*, 48ff.

⁶⁴⁸UT §9.10, p. 72.

⁶⁴⁹UT §9.10, pp. 71f. Of course, **yaqtul* is used as a historical present, but that is probably the case only in the literary texts, not in the spoken language. Perhaps final short vowels were beginning to be lost in Ugaritic; a phenomenon that might also be indicated by the many incorrect case-endings on nouns; see above, pp. 217f.

⁶⁵⁰On *yaqtulu* at Amarna, see Moran, "Byblos," especially pp. 39ff.

⁶⁵¹The dur. form *ū-šām-ra-šū-šū-nu-ti* *6:3:27, probably has a sg. subject, and so perhaps the *-u* is that of Ugaritic **yaqtulu*; but there are other possibilities; see p.242, n. 295.

cult assumption that the U scribes knew that the Akk. pret. had no final vowel, but nevertheless sometimes forgot that it was a perfective, past form, and equated it with their own imperfective **yaqtulu*.

b. Durative.

The dur., in both main and subordinate clauses, generally expresses action occurring over an extended period of time. In assertions, the tense value is often future; one example from the many will illustrate: *ina nissat libbīša bīt abīša tū-šab* "She will live in her father's house in her misery" 3:56:24f. Occasionally, the present is meant: *gabba ša i-ba-aš-ši ana FN u ša i-ba-aš-ši ana PN* "everything that belongs to FN and that belongs to PN" 5:173:14f.; cf. 1.21; 3:57:20.⁶⁵² Durative action in the past can also be described: e.g., *u lā i-ma-gār ana tamīsu*⁶⁵³ "but he would not agree to swear" 6:52b:6f.; *kunukka meher kunuk šarri rabī ītepšū u tuppāti sarrūti ina libbi GN i-ša-aṭ-ṭū-ru* "They made a seal, a copy of the great royal real, and were writing false documents in GN" 3:97:16ff.⁶⁵⁴

⁶⁵²Perhaps also *enūma kī ū-še-bal šarru bēl(u)ya sisī ana arđīšu* "whenever the king my lord sends horses to his servant" 5:98:9f. The following context is broken, however, and it is possible that *ušebbal* is a habitual past: "when-ever he would send."

⁶⁵³The text has *ID-mi-šu*; see above, p. 260, n. 368.

⁶⁵⁴Here probably belong the past dur. forms of *alāku* in 5:87: *anumma eleppētu ša nakrī il-la!-ka* "now, the enemies' ships have been coming" 11.12f; *inanna ? eleppētu ša nakrī ša il-la-ka-an-ni* "Now then, the enemies' ships which have been coming against me are seven" 11.27ff.; see pp. 231f.

As elsewhere in Akk., the *dur.* often connotes moods other than simple assertion: e.g., potentiality: ...*i]qb[i](?) pīqat [aballuṭ(?) u(?)] pīqat a-ma-at* "...said(?): perhaps I would live(?) and(?) perhaps I would die" *6:3:10f.; permission: *ina ūmt balāṭtēšu i-kal* "He may use it (all) the days of his life" 3:92:13f., and often; obligation: ⁶⁵⁵ *20 kaspā ina šattitēšu up-pal* ⁶⁵⁶ "He is to pay 20 silver per year" 3:135:13, and often.

The notion of potentiality is, of course, present in the protases of conditional sentences, and there the *dur.* is the normal tense: e.g., *šumma urram šēram PN₁ i-sē-³-er PN₂ mārēu* "if in future PN₁ rejects PN₂ as his son" 3:55:7ff., and often. ⁶⁵⁷ The normal tense of the apodosis too is the *dur.*, and usually permission or obligation is implied: e.g., the apodosis of 3:55:7ff., just given: *100 kaspā ana qātītēšu i-na-an-dīn* "he must give him 100 silver." ⁶⁵⁸ Since the notion of obligation is very close to that of injunction, it is not surprising to find the *prec.* or *imper.* in the apodosis, as occasionally in K as well (see above, p. 132); these are discussed below (section c).

Also related to the injunctive mood, is the regular use

⁶⁵⁵The sense seems to be less forceful than the *prec.*, for which, see below, section c.

⁶⁵⁶I take the verb in this passage, and the others like it, to be *uppulu* rather than (*w*)*abālu*; see above, pp. 250f.

⁶⁵⁷Other references are cited above, p. 348, n. 639.

⁶⁵⁸Other references are cited above, p. 347, n. 638.

of the *dur.* in negative commands. Two of the many examples will suffice to illustrate this use: *lā ta-šak-kān* "do not place" *3:19:22; *mamman lā i-leq-qè-šu* "no one may take it" 3:64a:8, and *p*.

It was noted above (section a), that the *pret.* sporadically (and incorrectly) replaces the *dur.* in all of these conditions, so far mentioned, in which the *dur.* is the normal tense in U.

In one text, the *dur.* expresses purpose:⁶⁵⁹ *inanna anumma 1600 šiltāha*⁶⁶⁰ [*er*!] *ina qāti PN atta[din] ana muhhi šarri bēlīya i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti* "Now I hereby give PN 1600 copper arrowheads, that he may take them (or: to take) to the king my lord" *3:5:12ff.; cf. 21ff.

In 3:68:8ff., the *dur.* is used for a punctual past tense, after a *pret.*: *u PN idūkšu u inaddin GN ana šarri bēlīšu* "PN killed him, and gave GN (back) to the king his lord." I can find no explanation for this; the second clause does not describe the circumstances during which the action of the first occurred, but rather an event subsequent to it. Nor does a purpose clause seem plausible. Note that, with *u*, the clauses resemble the situation in which a converted

⁶⁵⁹See above, p. 152, for a similar instance in K.

⁶⁶⁰*šiltāha er*! is written ^GI^KAK.KUM.TAG.GA URUDU.MEŠ in 211; in 2.13, the last two signs are broken off. For the reading *šiltāhu*, cf. *AHw*, 1236b; Nougayrol read it *mulmulu*, which is equally possible. The same logogram recurs in 6:104b:p. (a list), and there Nougayrol renders it *ūqu*, another word for arrow, and also a possibility. Note that the logogram is usually KAK.(U₄).TAG.GA, according to *AHw*, 1236b.

imperfect could arise in WS.⁶⁶¹

c. Imperative and Precative.

As in K, these forms are used correctly. Examples of both were given above, pp. 226f., 232f. All first and third person injunctives are expressed by the prec.; there is no evidence of a non-negative, jussive *iprus(a)* (i.e., Ugaritic **yaqtul(a)*).⁶⁶² The prec. usually expresses a wish: e.g., *ilānu šumšu lihalliḳ* "may the gods destroy his name" 3:105:57; *u bēl(u)ya ana panī šarri bēlīya liqbī* "and may my lord speak before the king my lord" 5:98:r8'f. Less often, it indicates more specifically an indirect command:⁶⁶³ e.g., *amīlū annātu lillikūni [alna bīt ili līrubū* "Let these men come (and) enter the temple" *5:142:28f. Note that this last example is in fact the apodosis of a conditional sentence. Often in that situation, a *dur.* occurs, indicating obligation ("should, must"),⁶⁶⁴ and thus a notion similar to that expressed by the prec., but probably with less force.⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶¹Perhaps the form is a scribal error, and should be emended to a pret.: *i-⟨na-⟩din*.

⁶⁶²Several examples of the pret. (= **yaqtul?*) with a negative, for the prohibitive, occur, however; see pp. 345ff.

⁶⁶³The line between "wish" and "indirect command" is very vague, of course; and the Akk. prec., indeed, the jussive throughout the Semitic languages, does not distinguish between those nuances at all. On translating according to context, cf. GAG §81d.

⁶⁶⁴See above, 352f.

⁶⁶⁵Once, an imper. is used in an apodosis: *inanna šumma eleppētu ša nakrī šanāt[u] ibašši tēma [ayylikām-ma šupr[al]nni* "Now if other ships of the enemy are present, send me word somehow(?)" 5:88:32ff.

Finally, in several instances, the prec., after an imper. or another prec., denotes purpose: e.g., *šupra[m-mi/a] dīna ša alpī[ka] lugammir-mi*⁶⁶⁶ *inanna dīna šāš[ū]*⁶⁶⁷ *gummir alpīya literrūninni* " 'Send the case concerning your oxen to me that I may complete (it).' Now then, complete that case that my oxen be returned to me" *5:142:12ff.

d. Stative.⁶⁶⁸

With adjectival verbs, the stative predicates the quality or attribute conveyed by the root: e.g., *[a]nā[ku](?) maršāku dannīš* "I was/have been very ill" *6:3:9; *šunu sarrū* "They are deceitful (i.e., liars)" 3:98:24; *rapīš* "It is wide" 5:8:8; *bani akanna ana pa<nī>ka kī yānu karānū...* "Does it seem right to you like this, that there are no vineyards?" *5:146:13.

The stative of active intransitive verbs describes the condition resulting from the action which the root signifies. With both of these categories of verbs, but especially with the latter, there is a semantic overlap in the meanings of the prefix-conjugations and the stative (e.g., *āšīb* "he sat down=he became seated"; *ašīb* "he is seated").⁶⁶⁹ Thus, it

⁶⁶⁶On this reading, see above, p. 233, n. 252.

⁶⁶⁷For this form, see above, p. 203, n. 138.

⁶⁶⁸On the treatment of the stative in this study, see the Introduction, pp. 12ff.

⁶⁶⁹Pointed out by Prof. T.O. Lambdin in a class, at Harvard University, on comparative Semitic philology.

is not surprising that some verbs are attested in both prefix-conjugation and stative forms, with little, if any difference in meaning. This is the case with four verbs in U. In two cases, the choice of the dur. rather than the stative may have been to indicate more clearly the future tense:

inūma naker PN₁ tupšarru itti šarri bēlīšu u PN₂ idūkšu
 "When PN₁ the scribe was at war with the king his lord, PN₂ killed him" 3:68:7ff., but *šanīta assurrim [šar GN(?)] it-tīya inakker* "Moreover perhaps the king of GN(?) will be at war with me" EA45:20f.; *gabbu qābū ...-ya ina GN₁ ašbū u gabba e[lepp]ētūya ina GN₂ ašbū* "All my ...-troops are situated in GN₁ and all my ships are situated in GN₂" 5:87:20ff., but *ina nissat libbīša bīt abīša tuššab* "She will live in her misery in her father's house" 3:56:24f. In an economic docket listing individuals with bad credit, however, we find: *PN₁ GN₁ uššab PN₂ GN₂ uššab* "PN₁: lives in GN₁; PN₂: lives in GN₂" 6:74:5f.; cf. 6:75f.:p. In these texts, there is no difference between *uššab* and *ašbū* in 5:87. In other cases, no obvious reason for the choice of a pret. or perf. rather than a stative (or vice versa) presents itself: *šumma... anāku mītāku* "if...I should die" 3:76a:4f., but *šumma PN imūt* "if PN should die" 5:5:7'; *šanīta PN ana šarri anih* "Moreover PN has been loyal to the king" 3:84:24; cf. 3:141:29f., but *ana muhhi šarri bēlīšu PN ētanah* 3:108:15f.; cf. 3:110a:7.

The stative of active transitive verbs also usually

predicates the condition resulting from the action of the verb in question. But it is therefore normally passive: e.g., *u mātum kām-ma nadât* "and the land is/could be/might be overthrown in this way" 5:87:25; *eqelšu karānšu...gabbu mimmi šumšišu nadin ana PN* "His field, vineyard,..., everything of his is given to PN" 3:68:4ff.

Some statives of active transitive verbs have a special active meaning, however. This is especially true of verbs denoting holding and acquisition.⁶⁷⁰ One verb that is often active in the stative is *našû*,⁶⁷¹ and there is one such example in U: [... *qadlu(?) kaspi ša n[al]ši PN* "...along with(?) the silver which PN holds" 5:176f.:12; but note that the *du dur. inašši* occurs in the same text (l.5; context broken). Another verb that frequently occurs as an active stative is *hašāhu*.⁶⁷² It is attested in only one text in U, in the protasis of two successive unmarked conditional sentences, in 3:53:11ff., quoted above, p. 330.

There are several other active statives in U, however, which, if they occur at all, are very rare elsewhere in Akk. One is the D verb *summuhu*. Normally, this means "to combine, mix, alloy"; but at Nuzi, it means "to give (someone: acc.) a portion" in the prefix-conjugations. In both Nuzi and U.

⁶⁷⁰Cf. M.B. Rowton, *JNES* 21, 233ff. (especially 239f., 243ff., 266ff.).

⁶⁷¹*Ibid.*, 245 (no.'s 63-7), and p.

⁶⁷²Cf. the examples in *CAD*, s.v. Rowton, op. cit. (above, n. 670), does not list any examples of *hašāhu*.

Akk., the stative means "to have a portion, share in (*ina*)."⁶⁷³ Perhaps the transformation developed as follows: originally, "to combine" perhaps came to mean "to link," or even "to associate"; "to associate someone with (*ina*) something" could be further extended to mean "to allot someone (acc.) something (*ina* or acc.)." The stative meaning in U and at Nuzi would thus be the passive of this: "to be allotted something (*ina* or acc.)." The best preserved of the five attestations is: *lā summuḥ ina eqli annī* "He may have no share in this field" 3:114:28.⁶⁷⁴

The stative of *nadānu* is also active in a small number of texts: e.g., *PN₁ GN-īyu 10 šiqḷa kaspi ina libbīšu ana PN₂ 5 šiqḷa ana PN₃ nadīn* "PN₁ the GN-ite gave 10 shekels of silver agreeably(?) to PN₂, 5 shekels to PN₃" 6:108:4ff. (Ec.); cf. 6:92a:9ff. (cf. the example with passive *nadīn*, 3:68:4ff., quoted above). Since active statives of *nadānu* are extremely rare in native Akk.,⁶⁷⁵ perhaps we should see here a reflection of the WS perfect.

The verb *ṣamātu* occurs only in the stative, and essentially only in one type of text: legal dockets describing the turnover of property from one person to another;⁶⁷⁶ e.g.,

⁶⁷³See AHw, 1017a, s.v.; the Nuzi and U forms are cited in mng 6.

⁶⁷⁴The other occurrences are 3:137b:7'; 5:4:9'ff.; 5:5:4'; 3:58a:7f. (with *šummuḥ*).

⁶⁷⁵Rowton, op. cit. (above, n. 670), cites only three instances, in no.'s 429 and 430, p. 293.

⁶⁷⁶See the discussion in CAD §, 94b.

karānu ṣamīt ana PN u ana mārīšū ad-dārīti "The vineyard is transferred to PN and to his sons forever" 3:35a:7ff. Since it is found only in U, it is presumably a Ugaritic word. But it does not occur in any of the Ugaritic texts published to date. Therefore, it cannot be determined whether *ṣamīt/ṣamat* represents the passive of a verb that is active in Ugaritic (**ṣamata* ⁶⁷⁷ "he transferred"), or whether **ṣamata* is an adjectival, or active intransitive, verb ("it (the estate, etc.) passed over/changed hands (to someone)").

It was suggested in an earlier section (pp. 234f.) that *ṣamat[a]* in 3:52a:16, statives of *zakû* with final *-a* rather than *-u* may represent WS perfects (i.e., **qatala*), formally at least, instead of the ventive.

The stative, since it is essentially a predicative verbal adjective,⁶⁷⁸ conveys no specific temporal nuance. However, apart from those that occur in protases, none of the forms refer to the future. To express an injunctive of a stative, *lû* is used: e.g., *lû zakû* "may they be free (of claims)" *5:142:30.

11. The Construction of the Infinitive

Most of the infinitives in U function as nouns only: e.g., *na-da-nu* "gift" 3:157a:15'; cf. *na-da-na* 3:118:21;

⁶⁷⁷Presumably with *a* rather than *i* as thematic vowel, on the basis of forms written *ṣa-ma-at*. See above, 234f.

⁶⁷⁸Cf. G. Buccellati, *JNES* 27, 1ff.

na-da-an-ša 3:65a:20,27; urubānū ša na-ba-ti-⁶⁷⁹šū-n[u]

"the guarantors of (i.e., against) their flight" 3:37b:7f.;
eqlēṭ ha-ba-li-ma "fields of/for indebtedness(?)"⁶⁷⁹ 3:46:
8.⁶⁸⁰

In the following example, the infinitive is in construct to an objective genitive, and dependent on the preposition
ana:⁶⁸¹ anumma PN mār-šiprīni ana ša-a-li⁶⁸² šulmi ša šarri
bēlīni naltaparēu "We hereby send PN our messenger to inquire
after the welfare of the king our lord" 4:294:8ff. Another
instance, after aššum,⁶⁸³ may involve the same construction:
PN iš'am 5 pu[rīda eqli] aššum e-pē-šī⁶⁸² u r[a-ša-pī(?)⁶⁸⁴]
bīt : kunahi ša DN "PN bought 5 p.'s of field in order to

⁶⁷⁹The meaning of this term in this passage remains obscure; cf. Nougayrol's comments in *PRU* 3, 46, n. 1.

⁶⁸⁰Note also, in the very poorly written text 5:145f.,
ana ū-ri-di-ia, presumably for ana arādīya "for my descent"
l.12. P.-R. Berger's suggestion (*UF* 2, 291), that the form
has "'assyrischer Lautbestand' mit Imāla" (i.e., u- from wa-,
and an unexplained a+e in the second syllable), is interesting,
but less likely than the assumption that this scribe simply
knew almost no Akk. beyond a few basic formulas.

⁶⁸¹Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 183ff. The construction is quite rare in MB; cf. *ibid.*, 185.

⁶⁸²The case-ending on the bound form is normal in U;
see above, pp. 220f.

⁶⁸³Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 273ff. Most of
the examples there are from OB Mari, and none are given for
MB.

⁶⁸⁴The copy has only ⁷; Nougayrol strangely ignores
this, and translator as if u were the last sign in the line:
"[PN] achète...en vue de bâtir, mais(?) la maison kunahi est
à [DN]." Our suggested restoration is merely a guess, of
course, but cf. 3:112b:9; 3:125:12; 3:137:9, in which repairing
(raṣāpu) an estate is a condition of the transactions.
P.-R. Berger, *UF* 1, 12, suggests n[a-ša-rī].

(re)build and repair(??) the *k*.-house of DN" 5:8f.:17ff.
 Since the case of *bīt*(É) cannot be determined, however, it
 is also possible that it is acc., as the direct object of
 the verbs.⁶⁸⁵ (In native Akk., where the main verb stands
 at the end of the clause, such a construction would be *aššum*
bīt k. epēši.⁶⁸⁶) Still another example, after *ana*, has an
 objective pronominal suffix:⁶⁸⁷ *u lā imaggar ana ta!(ID)-*
*mi-šu*⁶⁸⁸ "but he would not agree to swear it (the oath)" 6:52:
 6. It is possible that the suffix is subjective, i.e.,
 "...to his swearing," but this seems less likely.⁶⁸⁹

In two economic texts, infinitives occur after *ana*
 without a subject or object expressed.⁶⁹⁰ In one, the
 infinitive is probably a WS word: ...*qāt PN nadin ana ma-*
*ka-ri*⁶⁹¹ "...was given to PN to sell" 6:119a:5f. The other

⁶⁸⁵In 5:20:1ff.(Ec.), the case of the following noun
 again cannot be discerned: *100 kaspu aššum le-qē-e* SIGZA.GIN
ana qāti PN "100 silver for acquiring *uqnū*-wool for(?) PN."
 Another example occurs in a damaged text: *ana la-qe-e ši-x*
 "to take..." 5:81:12.

⁶⁸⁶Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*, 269ff.

⁶⁸⁷Cf. *ibid.*, 205ff.; the MB examples are on p. 207.

⁶⁸⁸The emendation is discussed above, p. 260, n. 368.

⁶⁸⁹Such is the case with [*ana tlummtšu* in the K text
 6:36:14; see p. 155. Cf. Aro, *Infinitivkonstruktionen*,
 200ff. (MB on p. 202).

⁶⁹⁰Cf. *ibid.*, 128ff.

⁶⁹¹*makāru* meaning "to do business" appears only in OA;
 cf. CAD M/1, 126f. *mkr* is attested as a verb in Ugaritic;
 cf. UT §1477, p. 433. However, since the next example, also
 from an Ec. text, is perhaps Ass., perhaps the OA verb is
 what appears here.

short text appears to be pure Ass.: 21 URUDU.MEŠ x (x) x
 BI SU a-na e-pa-še ta-din a-na PN₁ DUMU PN₂⁶⁹² "21 copper...
 for building was given to PN₁ son of PN₂" 6:110a.⁶⁹³

12. The Syntax of the Accusative Case

a. General.

Very few clauses are attested in which the verb takes
 a double acc.: PN₁ itti PN₂...eqel PN₃...pūhata īpuš "PN₁
 exchanged the field of PN₃...with PN₂..." 3:45b:4ff.; cf.
 amat mašikta itepšūnāši "They did an evil thing to us" 5:87f.:
 30f.; lišebbūki šībūta "May they sate you with long life" 5:
 148:10; PN 100 hurāša šarra bēlšu uktabbit "PN honored the
 king his lord with 100 gold" 3:109a:10ff.; cf. also 3:55:6,
 quoted below. With ekēmu, which usually takes a double acc.⁶⁹⁴

⁶⁹²Nougayrol reads the first two lines: 21 erā^M amat(?)
 Iib-bi-su a-na e-pa-še ta-din "21 (sicles de) cuire (que)
 la servante de Ibbisu a livrés pour façonnage." It seems
 unlikely, however, that a "servante" would have the autho-
 rity to dispense her master's property. Further the sign
 in question is not GEME₂. Since epāše is an Ass. form, I
 would suggest that ta-din is the Ass. stative (tadin; cf.
 GAG §102m, and the forms listed in Hecker, GKT, 173; no
 statives of n/tadānu are listed for MA in Mayer, UGMA,
 93f.). After 21 URUDU.MEŠ, we read ~~erā~~ BI SU. Per-
 haps we could read el!-lu! pē-gu_x "pure white"; ellu is
 not attested with erū, but does describe other metals (sil-
 ver and gold; cf. CAD E, 103a); pēgū occurs once with erū
 (cf. CAD E, 322a); however, in Ass., paḡiu is expected (cf.
 AHw, 857a). A less likely possibility is to read 21 erū
 el!-lu! kās-su ana epāše, "21 pure copper to make/do X(?),"
 and compare this with qa-zu-ma epēšu, attested twice at Nuzi
 and as yet not understood; cf. CAD K, 311a.

⁶⁹³The form la-lak 6:74:4(Ec.) is more likely for lā
 allak (ls dur.) than an infinitive (lā alāk) in the absolute
 state; cf. A.F. Rainey, IOS 3, 41.

⁶⁹⁴Cf. GAG §145e, and the examples in the dictionaries.

the second object is replaced by a prepositional phrase with *ištu*, on the analogy of the far more frequently used *leqû*: e.g., *mamman ištu qāti PN...ul ekkimšu* "No one may take it from PN" 3:67:13f.

The acc. is occasionally used adverbially.⁶⁹⁵ The indefinite pronoun *mimmam* may be an acc. of respect in *[m]im-mam eli FN...[lā] ittazzamūni* "They must not complain at all against FN..." 3:66a:6ff.; it may be the direct object, however ("may not complain about anything"). As in K, an acc. of time ("when") is the ubiquitous *urra(m) šēra(m)*⁶⁹⁶ "in future." An acc. of place ("where") is *bīt abīša tuš-šab* "she will live in her father's house" 3:56:25, replacing *ina* plus the gen. In some economic texts, a number of verbs seem to govern an acc. of place rather than an expected prepositional phrase; perhaps these are for the sake of brevity:⁶⁹⁷ note, e.g., both *PN ina GN uššab* and *PN GN uššab* for "PN: lives in GN" in 6:75:p.; cf. 6:74:5,6(both acc.). In the last text, there occurs also *PN ša taba'û*⁶⁹⁸ *GN* "PN who is sought in GN" in 11:1f.

Other acc.'s are used sporadically in lieu of other prepositional phrases: e.g., *PN₁...irtakus PN₂...ana mārū-*

⁶⁹⁵Cf. GAG §§146,147.

⁶⁹⁶Cf. PRU 3, 230, s.v.

⁶⁹⁷Even a dative becomes an acc., with the omission of *ana*: ...5 *subātu 2000 uqnû qāti PN nadin ana makārî* "...5 garments, 2000(-weight of) u.-wool is given to PN to sell" 6:119a.

⁶⁹⁸See above, pp.320f.

*tīšu mārūt ammati*⁶⁹⁹ *irkuššu* "PN₁...bound PN₂...in adoptive sonship; in a sonship of ... he bound him" 3:55:4ff.; in the second clause, the acc. replaces the *ana* plus gen. of the first. Note also *FN kasap terhatīša...zakât* "FN is free (of claims) regarding the silver of her bride-price" 3:56:21ff., where the acc. is used instead of the usual *ištu* plus gen.⁷⁰⁰ The notion of intent is usually expressed by a phrase with *ana*: e.g., *u PN₁ ittaši eqelšu...u iddinšu ana šarrati ana pūhat eqel/eqlēš PN₂* "PN took his field...and gave it to the queen as a substitute for PN₂'s field(s)" 3:50b:5ff.; cf. 3:78:12f.; 3:49b:13. In one text, however, the same notion is expressed by an acc. in apposition to the object of the previous clause (left unexpressed in its own clause): *u ittaši bīta eqlēti u ittadin ana PN...pūha bītīšu u eqlīšu* "He took the house (and) fields and gave (them) to PN as a substitute for his own house and field" 6:27:5'ff.

Finally, the ordinals *ištēn*⁷⁰¹ "first" and *šanū* "second" are used adverbially in the acc. for "firstly, in the first place," and "secondly, in the second place": e.g., *ištēn PN iddinšu u šanām RN...iddinšu* "Firstly, PN gave it, and secondly, RN...gave it" 3:87f.:rl2'ff. Often, *ištēn* has the suffix *-šu*, which is frequently attached to numerical ad-

⁶⁹⁹The meaning of this word is unknown.

⁷⁰⁰See above, p. 266.

⁷⁰¹*ištēn* is of course the cardinal number "one." However, it is also often used ordinally, replacing the poorly attested *ištīyū*; cf. GAG §70a; CAD I/J, 278a (*ištēn* 3).

verbs in Akk.⁷⁰² It is attached to "secondly" only in the prepositional-phrase equivalent of *šanā(m)*: *ina šanīšu*, e.g., in 3:46:19. In addition to *šanām* (often with *-ma*⁷⁰³) and *ina šanīšu* for "secondly," there also occurs the *f. šanīta*, e.g., in 3:50b:11. This last is of course extremely common throughout Akk. as an adverbial acc. introducing new paragraphs, its meaning weakened to "moreover."⁷⁰⁴ Besides *ištēn(šu)*, there also occurs once *ittīlta* (3:167:14), the derivation of which is obscure.⁷⁰⁵

b. The Resumptive Accusative Suffix.

Resumptive acc. suffixes are somewhat more frequent in U than in K, but they are still not a common feature. As in K, the suffix refers to the word or phrase that is the direct object of the verb to which the suffix is attached. Normally, they are found in main clauses: e.g., *[u bēl(u)]ya PN [ana p]lanī šarri bēlīya lušēribbē[u]* "May my lord have PN enter before the king my lord" 5:98:r3'f. Once, the feature is found within a relative clause: *ša FN...ištu ahīya ša*⁷⁰⁶

⁷⁰²Cf. GAG §71a,b. CAD I/J, 284, under *ištīššu*, labels the form simply as an adverb.

⁷⁰³The *-ma* does not alter the meaning; except perhaps to emphasize the distinction between the two acts; see above, pp. 322ff.

⁷⁰⁴It is especially common in WPA; cf. AHW, 1164.

⁷⁰⁵Cf. GAG §71b, Anm.; CAD I/J, 282f.

⁷⁰⁶On the extra *ša*, see above, p. 335; it seems improbable that this is related to the occurrence of the resumptive suffix.

thuzšē "whoever takes FN...from my brother (in marriage)" 3:76a:6ff. There is only one instance in which the relative pronoun *ša*, serving as the direct object of its clause, is resumed by an acc. suffix: 3:90b:10f., quoted above, p. 334. In contrast, note, e.g., *terhatšša ša talteqe* "the silver of her bride-price, which she took" 3:56:21. With but one exception, the object to which the suffix refers always precedes its verb; the exception is: *u uzakkššu šarru PN* "And the king freed PN (of claims)" 3:153f.:13f.

Unlike K, where the resumptive suffix refers only to persons, in U it may refer to any object: e.g., *RN...bšta u eqlēti ša PN₁ ina GN ana PN₂ ittadinšunu* "RN...has given PN₁'s estate and fields in GN to PN₂" 3:89b:2ff.; cf. 3:90b:10f. As the examples thus far quoted show, the resumptive pronoun usually agrees with its referent in gender and number. Exceptions are infrequent; note, e.g., *u PN bšt GN₁... u eql GN₂ ittašššu* "PN has taken the estate of GN₁...and the field of GN₂" 3:85:7ff.; cf. 3:102ff.:13f.

The distance between the object and the verb with the suffix varies considerably; for contrast, note, e.g., *u bēl(u)ya PN kī damqi kī pābi ana panī šarri bēlššu qarr[ib]ššu* "May my lord present PN well and properly before the king his lord" *3:5:26ff.; and *u mārššu unammaršunu*⁷⁰⁷ "and he will ... his sons" 3:82:13.⁷⁰⁸ Thus, the distance of the object

⁷⁰⁷The meaning of this verb is obscure here; cf. pp. 245f., n. 308.

⁷⁰⁸Cf. also: *u eqla(?)ilaqqššu* "and he will take the field(?)" 3:52a:24f.

from its verb is not a criterion for employing a resumptive suffix. Nor is emphasis on the object;⁷⁰⁹ most of the examples can be paralleled by others *without* the resumptive pronoun, e.g., immediately before the last example: *šanīta PN zittašunu ana ekalli ušerreb* "Moreover, PN will deliver their shares into the palace" 3:82:16f. (vs., e.g., 5:98:r3'f., above); *RN...GN qadu gabbi mimmi šumšīša iddin ana PN* 3:146b:2ff. (vs., e.g., 3:89b:2ff., above); etc. No other formal criterion for the use of a resumptive suffix in such cases presents itself.

In a few instances, it is possible that the words or phrases which are resumed by suffixes, and which we have been calling the direct object of the verbs on which they occur, are instead examples of *casus pendens*. This possibility is especially attractive when the proposed "object" is in the nom.⁷¹⁰ An example might be: *šanīta bītu(ē-tu₄) eqlētu ša PN₁ ina GN ana PN₂ šarru iddinšu*, 3:102ff.:38f., which would then be translated: "Moreover, as for PN₁'s estate and fields in GN--the king gave them (lit.: it) to PN₂." There are, however, a number of strong arguments against such an interpretation. First, there are many incorrect case-endings in U,⁷¹¹ and so, that should not receive the highest priority in determining the syntax. Secondly, in the same text as our

⁷⁰⁹As in generally the case in native Akk.; cf. *GAG* §130h.

⁷¹⁰Cf. the example in *GAG* §128c(γ).

⁷¹¹See above, pp. 217f.

example, and elsewhere (as noted above), there occur parallel clauses without resumptive suffixes, and in which, therefore, the parallel words or phrases *must* be direct objects of the following verbs--even when those words or phrases are (incorrectly) nom.; note, e.g., several lines before our example: *šanīta bītu(Ē-tu₄) eqļu ša PN₃ ina libbi GN₂ ana PN₂ iddin šarru*⁷¹² 11.29f. Finally, whenever the subject of the verb occurs before the word or phrase under consideration, as happens more often than not,⁷¹³ there can be no question of a casus pendens; the word or phrase *must* be the direct object. Thus, if the above interpretation were valid, any word or phrase *not* preceded by the subject of the following verb would be labelled a casus pendens, but those that *are* preceded by a subject would be labelled direct objects. This is a very unlikely distinction.

There is, however, one small group of examples which, as in K, may nevertheless be casus pendentes, namely, those in which a relative clause is resumed by a pronominal suffix. There are only two of these, and in both cases it is impossible to determine whether the clause is to be considered the direct object of the verb, or a casus pendens, outside the

⁷¹²It is extremely unlikely that the order of subject and verb in these passages is significant. As a third example from the same text, note: *šanīta eqlēš PN₄...ina GN₂ ana PN₂ šarru iddin* 11.35f.

⁷¹³E.g., still in the same text, note: *u PN₂ 500 kaspa (KÙ.BABBAR-pa) ana šarri iddinšu* "And PN₂ gave the king 500 silver" 1.31.

main clause: *ša ušbalkit nidna annā DN...liš'alšu* "May DN
...hold responsible (lit.: ask) whoever overturns this gift"
or "As for whoever overturns this gift--may DN...hold him
responsible" 3:84:25ff.; *ša FN...ištu aḥṭya ša ṭḥuṣṣi DN*
lirahhiṣṣu "May DN inundate whoever takes FN...(in marriage)
from my brother" or "As for whoever takes...--may DN inundate
him" 3:76a:6ff.⁷¹⁴

13. Incomplete and Interrupted Grammar

a. Ellipsis.

The verb *paṭāru* is normally active-transitive, meaning
"to loosen, remove, redeem, etc.": *u iṭṭuršu ištu aškāpūti*
"He removed him from the leatherworkers" 3:78:8f.; cf. also
6:44:4f. With ellipsis of the object, however, the verb
means "to depart":⁷¹⁵ e.g., *u tapaṭṭar ana sūqi* "She will
depart into the street" 3:60b:15; cf. 3:65:22; 3:75a:11,16;
3:82:27; *5:137:27.

⁷¹⁴In a similar passage (3:105:56f.), the relative
clause *must* be a casus pendens, since it represents a gen.
dependent on a noun; see below, p. 371.

⁷¹⁵Cf. GAG §184d; AHw, 850 (*paṭāru*, mng. 14). The verb
w/mu'uru "to command" is also normally active-transitive:
e.g., *FN [...] gabba tuma'er* "FN...will control everything"
3:172b:5. But it occurs without an object in 3:81:32. This
is not an instance of ellipsis, however; the normal construc-
tion, with a direct object, is replaced by *eli*: *akīl narkabti*
lā uma'er eli PN u eli mārīšu "The overseer of the chariotry
may have no power over PN and his sons." The construction
with *eli* is apparently due to an equation, in the mind of the
scribe, of *w/mu'uru* with WS **malaka*, which was intransitive,
for note the parallel sentence: *hazannu āli u akīl eqlēti lā*
imalīlk elīšu "The town mayor and the overseer of the fields
may have no power over him" 3:135a:15f. That the usage is
Ugaritic is proven by *aḥdy . dymlk . ʿl . ilm* "It will be I:
alone who rule over the gods" UT 51:7:49f., p. 173.

The following, syntactically difficult, passage is perhaps a result of ellipsis: *u PN ušērib 1000 kapa u 3 bīlta siparri 4 amta...[X]paššūra ša ušērib PN ana bītī FN* "And PN brought 1000 silver, 3 talents of bronze, 4 maidservants... etc., X tables; what PN brought into FN's house" 5:173:6ff. What occurs after the list is not a complete sentence; it is a relative clause which neither modifies a noun nor serves as any other part of speech in a larger main clause.⁷¹⁶ It seems that a subject, for which the clause would serve as predicate, has been omitted, for instance *annū* or *amātu annātu*: "(This/these things are) what PN brought..."

As noted in the previous chapter (p. 160), von Soden considers certain phrases beginning with *aššum* to be cases of ellipsis.⁷¹⁷ Two such examples occur in U: *bēlī aššum dīni ša PN kī tašpura...inanna...altakan* "My lord, concerning the case of PN (I am writing): since you wrote...I have now established..." 3:4:9ff.; and *aššum alpīya ša iltarqū amīlū GN kī taqtabi...inanna...gummīr* "Concerning my oxen, which the men of GN stole (I am writing): since you said...now then, complete..." *5:141f.:7ff.

b. There are no oaths quoted in these texts.

c. Parenthesis.⁷¹⁸

A possible instance of this is: *RN...ilteqe bītātī*

⁷¹⁶Cf. GAG §165e-j.

⁷¹⁷GAG §184c.

⁷¹⁸Cf. GAG §182.

eqlēti ištu šarri ina kaspi ištēn ina kaspi u ša[nīt]a nidnu bītāti eqlēti immerāti alpī maršītu ša PN "RN(the crown prince)...took estates and fields from the king in exchange for silver--first, in exchange for silver, and secondly, as a gift--(namely:) the estates, fields, sheep, oxen, the property of PN" 3:102:1ff.

d. Casus Pendens.⁷¹⁹

One example of a casus pendens is required by normal Akk. grammar; since a relative clause in which the determinative pronoun may not stand in a genitive relationship,⁷²⁰ we have: *ša tuppū annām unakker ilanu šumšu lihalliḫ* "As for whoever alters this tablet, may the gods destroy his name," for "...the name of whoever..." 3:105:56f. A similar, though not required, transformation has taken place in the following: *u mannum-mē ina libbīšunu ša ukabbi[t] PN ummašu ana šuwāti tanandin* "And as for either of them (of two sons) who honors his mother FN, to him will she give" *Syl8:249f.:24ff.* (for *ana mannim-mē...ša* "to either of them who..."). Another example of casus pendens occurs in the same text: *u anumma 2 mārūya PN₁ rabū u PN₂ šehru mannum-mē ina libbīšunu ša izziz...umalli* "And now, as for my two sons, PN₁, the elder, and PN₂, the younger--either of them who would stand ...will pay" *ibid.:14ff.* Note also *šanīta imēru ša illeqe!*

⁷¹⁹GAG §128 ("zusammengesetzte Nominalsätze").

⁷²⁰GAG §165k.

ultu akanna inanna anumma PN...altapar imēra šāšū ana qāti
PN...t[ē]r "As to the ass which was taken from here--I am
*hereby sending PN...; return that ass with PN" *6:12:11ff.*

After one instance of a casus pendens, the main clause commences with *u* (of apodosis), presumably a WS phenomenon:⁷²¹
lū māru lū mār[u ša] PN u lā išū[ni...] "As for any son or daughter of PN--they may not have (a share)..." 3:102:18f.

e. There are no clear instances of anacoluthon in these texts.

⁷²¹Cf. Joüon, *GHB* §176a,j, and the examples cited there, e.g., II Kings 16:14: *wə-'ēt pənē ham-mizbaḥ han-nəḥōset 'āšer li-pnē yḥwh way-yaqrēb mē-'ēt pənē hab-bāyit* "As for the bronze altar which was before Yahweh, he removed (it) from in front of the house"; cf. I Kings 15:13; and also in the Mesha Stele: *ʿmry . mlk . yšr'l . wyʿnw . 't . m'b . ymn . rbn* "As for Omri, king of Israel, he oppressed Moab for many days" MI:4f. (H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, I, 3rd ed. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1971), 33.

PART III

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

1. *Summary*

What follows is a brief recapitulation of the evidence presented in Parts I and II, in the areas in which the two dialects share features that differ from native Akk., and in the areas in which K and U differ from each other. Only these features are mentioned; they are presented in the same order and with the same section numbers and letters under which they appear in Parts I and II. Therefore, certain sections, in which the features discussed above present no peculiarities vis-à-vis native Akk. in either K or U, are omitted below.

It must be remembered, when features are being compared, that the K corpus is much smaller than the U corpus. Therefore, certain features may be lacking in K simply by coincidence. (However, the U corpus, especially in the legal texts, is very repetitive, whereas the K corpus is not.)

B.b. K: 21; U: 172ff.

In U, MEŠ and HI.A often follow grammatically sg. nouns. In K, this is probably so with words for metals only.

B.c. K: 22; U: 175.

In U, only two verbs, both I-³, have an extra initial

vowel-sign. In K, the number is larger, and the feature is not confined to verbs I-'. .

B.f. K: 24; U: 176..

In both dialects, a very small number of words contain an unexpected extra vowel-sign.

B.g. K: 24; U: 176f.

Only U exhibits any examples of incorrect broken writings.

B.h. K: 24ff.; U: 177ff.

In both, there is a substantial body of evidence which shows that *i* and *e* were never necessarily written distinctly, and, in fact, that they were probably not phonemically distinct.

B.i. K: 26; U: 184f.

In both, only a small percentage (about 15%) of the appropriate forms shows the change *uparris*→*uperris*.

B.j. K: 26; U: 185f.

ea and *ia* have become *â* in both dialects, with one exception in U.

B.k. K: 26; U: 186.

Initial *w* has been lost in both, but is written in one example in U; writings of intervocalic *w* are always *m* in K, but vacillate between *w* and *m* in U.

B.l. K: 26f.; U: 186ff.

In both, mimation has been lost, except when not final, and in a few archaizing/frozen forms.

B.m. K: 28; U: 188f.

In K, *š+l* always takes place, with the exception of *ištu* (always with *š*). In U, *š+l* usually, but not always takes place, and *ultu* occurs sporadically.

B.n. K: 28.; U: 189.

Only one example in each dialect shows the change: root-final dental/sibilant + *-š* → *-ss-*.

B.o. K: 28f.; U: 189f.

In both, a small number of words indicate some confusion in the pronunciation or representation of *s* and *š*.

B.p. K: 29; U: 190.

Both show sporadic, but inconsistent, nasalization of double voiced stops. In K, the dur. of *nadānu* never (in five exx.) shows nasalization; in U, it usually (but not always) does.

C.l.a. K: 30; U: 191f.

U contains a number of dat. independent personal pronouns, while K has none; but the latter fact is probably coincidental.

C.1.b. K: 30; U: 192.

attu- occurs twice in K, never in U.

C.1.c. K: 30ff.; U: 192ff. (genitive suffixes).

In K, the *ls* is always written with *-IA*. In U, this is true with the exception of a few (archaizing) vocative forms, which are (correctly) *-ē*, all in the letters.

3ms in K is consistently *-šu* (except *aššassu*). In U, *amatēsu* occurs once, *nīdnuš* once; otherwise always *-šu*.

3fs in K is *-ša*, with one exception (*-ši*). U has *-ša* most often, but *-sa* frequently, and *-ši* twice.

U has *-šina* for the only expected 3fp; K has *-šunu*, once.

C.1.d. K: 32f.; U: 196ff. (accusative suffixes).

For 3fs, K always has *-ši*. U has *-ša* three times, *-ši* only once.

For 3mp, K has *-šunūti*, except once *-šunu*. U has *-šunūti* in the letters, except twice *-šunu* on *nadānu*; but in legal texts, *-šunu* is used, with one (possibly two) exception(s).

C.1.e. K: 33f.; U: 199ff. (dative suffixes).

For *ls*, K always has *-a(m)/-nī(m)*, i.e., the ventive. In U, the acc. suffix occurs as often as the simple ventive for the dat.

2ms is always *-akku/-nikku* (i.e., with the ventive) in both.

C.2.a. K: 34ff.; U: 202ff. (anaphoric pronoun).

For ms nom. *šū* and *šūt* occur in both; the oblique is always *šāšu* in K, but either *šāšu* or *šuwāti* in U.

The fs nom. is *šīt* (once) in U, not attested in K; the oblique is *šāši* in K, not attested in U.

The mp nom. is *šunu* in U, not attested in K; the oblique is either *šāšunu* or *šunūti* in K, not attested in U.

The 3fp (oblique) is replaced by the 3mp in K; not attested in U.

C.2.d. K: 37ff.; U: 205ff. (indefinite pronouns).

For the personal, K has only *mannum-mê* (once, with *ša*, as a general relative) and *mamma* (always in negative contexts). U also has *mannum-mê*, with and without *ša*, for the general relative, but *mamman*, *mamma*, *mannum-ma*, and *mannum-mê* all occur in negative contexts.

For the impersonal, K has *mīnum-mê* (used like *mannum-mê*) and *mimma* (like *mamma*). U has *mīnum-mê*, *mimma*, *mimmam*, and *mimmam-ma*.

mimmû in K is indeclinable, and occurs only with suffixes. In U, it is sometimes declined, and may occur without suffixes.

The form *ayyānum-ma* "anyone" occurs once in K, not in U.

C.2.e. K: 41f.; U: 212ff.

In both K and U, *gabbu* is sometimes declined, other times treated as an indeclinable form *gabba*.

C.3. K: 42ff.; U: 215ff. (noun and adjective).

Mistakes in case-endings in U tend to be the nom. replacing the gen. or acc. No such tendency is apparent in K.

The sg. bound form in K is generally according to normal Akk. rules. In U, however, the majority of sg. bound forms have case-endings.

In U, the treatment of nouns after numerals and measurements differs from normal Akk. In K, the evidence is insufficient for any conclusions.

C.4.a. K: 51ff.; U: 226ff. (markers of person in verbs).

The 3fs prefix in K is the same as the 3ms, with the exception of one text (*t-*). In U, it has *t-*, with very few exceptions.

The 1p prefix in K is more often *na-* than *nī-*. In U, the sole form has *na-*.

There are two probable 3mp verbs with *t-* prefix in U. The K forms present no unusual features.

The 3fp is poorly attested and somewhat problematic in both dialects.

The prec. in K exhibits no specifically Ass. features. In U, most forms that exhibit a difference are Bab., but a few Ass. forms occur, especially in the Š.

The stative in K presents no problems (two D forms are Ass.). A number of forms in U have incorrect theme vowels; others may represent WS perfects.

C.4.b. K: 55ff.; U: 237ff.

The ventive is used correctly and consistently in letters in both K and U. It is rare in K legal texts. In K treaty texts and U legal texts, the ventive occurs with few exceptions only on pl. verbs, and probably does not function as the ventive in native Akk.; its occurrence in such cases is problematic.

C.4.c. K: 60ff.; U: 242f.

The subjunctive appears in K in over half of the examples where it is expected. In U, it occurs only once in the entire corpus.

C.4.d. K: 63ff.; U: 243ff. (derived conjugations).

The G in K presents no problems. In U, several roots have incorrect or variable theme vowels.

The Gtn is used more often in K than in U (where both possible forms are problematic).

On form in K (*nattak(k)ir*) may be a D with an incorrect prefix; otherwise in K, the D is usually correctly formed and used. In U, the D exhibits several peculiarities: it is rarely found in the dur., even when the dur. is expected; the perf. occurs only once; two or three forms have a G prefix; several D's in U are not attested or rare in the D elsewhere in Akk.

The Š and N present few problems in either dialect.

Apart from the Gtn, *t-* and *tan-*forms are rare in both.

C.4.e. K: 67ff.; U: 249ff. (weak verbs).

In verbs II-' , the ' is frequently written or indicated by a broken writing in U. There are few examples in K.

Verbs III-weak in both dialects always show contraction of the final vowel and a vocalic suffix. In U, forms such as *ilaqqe* and *iqtebi* occur as well as *ileqqe* and *iqtabi*, perhaps due to internal analogical re-formations. In K, only the normal Bab. forms (*ileqqe*, *iqtabi*) are found.

C.5. K: 73ff.; U: 262ff. (prepositions).

eli does not occur in K, perhaps only by coincidence.

In both K and U, the range of meaning exhibited by *ištu* is considerably greater than it is in native Akk.; generally, it tends to replace *ina* in several nuances and idioms, perhaps due to WS influence. *ultu* is attested only in U.

The comparative preposition in K is *kī*. In U, it is *kīma*, and once *kīmē*, neither of which occurs in K.

lētu occurs once in a prepositional phrase in K, never in U.

mahrū does not occur in prepositional phrases in either dialect.

In both K and U, *ana muhhi* occurs frequently to express motion toward or against someone.

In U, *qātu* occurs very frequently in prepositional phrases (*ana/ina/ištu qāti*). In K, it occurs as such only once.

C.6. K: 82ff.; U: 273ff. (adverbs).

Several adverbs are attested in U that do not occur in K (e.g., *akanna B*, *amma*, *annaka*, *assurrim*), and vice versa (e.g., *ahāmiš*, *mithāriš*); but comparisons are difficult because of the few attestations of each form, and the smaller size of the K corpus.

The expression *inanna anumma* is common in U, unattested in K.

urram šēram always has mimation in K (six occurrences). It usually has mimation in U, but often occurs without it.

The various expressions for "forever" attested in U do not come up in K.

C.7. K: 87ff.; U: 281.

Enclitic *-mê* seems to have a broader range of use in K than in U.

C.9. K: 91f.; U: 284ff.

There are very few certain Assyrianisms in either dialect; for the most part they are pronominal and verbal forms. The number in U is perhaps slightly higher, proportionately, than the number in K.

D.1.a-b. K: 93ff.; U: 288ff.

Verbal clauses (including those with the stative) in K are almost without exception verb-final. In U, there is no fixed order; most often, the subject and object precede the verb, while adverbial constituents follow the verb, al-

though many variations occur.

D.1.c. K: 95ff.; U: 296ff.

In nominal clauses, the order in both K and U is normally subject-predicate; there are more exceptions to this in U than in K. Several times in K, and once in U, there occur nominal clauses of the type $X Y \check{s}\check{u}$ for "X is Y," a construction that is probably WS in origin.

D.2.b. K: 99ff.; U: 304ff.

In U, two bound forms are followed by *-ma*, as may happen with enclitic *m* in Ugaritic. The use of a bound form (as opposed to the unbound form and *\check{s}a*) is more common in U than in K. The construction $X-\check{s}u \check{s}a Y$ for "the X of Y" occurs in both corpora, but is more common in U than in K. The construction $\check{s}a Y X-\check{s}u$ for "the X of Y" occurs rarely in K, not at all in U.

D.3. K: 106ff.; U: 311ff. (agreement).

The letters in both groups are very consistent in exhibiting proper concord. The more formulaic legal and treaty texts contain more errors. A sg. subject with a pl. verb is very rare in both K and U; a pl. subject with a sg. verb is rare in K, but is common in U. There are more instances of lack of agreement between nouns and their adjectives in U than in K, but the phenomenon is rare in both. In U, pl. antecedents are frequently referred to by a sg. pronoun (e.g., *iddinšu* "he gave them(!)"); this does not occur in K.

D.5. K: 110ff.; U: 319ff. (negation).

In both dialects, *lā* occurs much more frequently than *uḷ*. In K, both negatives occur in main clauses and protases (none in other subordinate clauses); in U, both occur in main clauses, but only *lā* in protases, and in the sole subordinate clause. In prohibitions, K has only (*lū*) *lā*; U has *lā* or *uḷ*, although the latter is rare.

The particle of non-existence *yānu* is common in U, and occasionally has an "object" rather than a "subject" (e.g., *pīlka yānu* "there is no feudal service"), probably due to WS influence. *yānu* is not attested in U.

The vetitive is not attested in either dialect.

D.6. K: 112f.; U: 321f.

lū is common in K, rare in U. In both, it serves to make injunctive both nominal clauses and the stative, and, when repeated in lists, means "whether...or." In K, it also transforms the dur. into an injunctive (three times), and strengthens *lā* in prohibitions (five times). It is not found with these uses in U, but there it occurs once as an asseverative particle.

D.7. K: 113ff.; U: 322ff.

Non-coordinating enclitic *-ma* is much more common in U than in K. It occurs even on verbs, rarely in K, often in U.

D.8. K: 117ff.; U: 325ff. (coordination of clauses).

To join clauses, *-ma* is used sporadically in K, very rarely in U; the occurrences in K conform in used to native Akk.; at least one of the (two or three) U examples does not.

The normal conjunction in both dialects is *u*. Many of the examples of its use are probably of WS origin.

-ma u occurs once in K, and is used as in OB. It appears several times in U, but the *-ma* probably does not have a connective force.

D.9.a. K: 129ff.; U: 330ff.

Unmarked conditional sentences are very rare in both K and U.

The normal tense in the protasis is the dur. in both dialects; in the apodosis, the dur. and prec. (rarely imper.) occur.

D.9.b. K: 134ff.; U: 332ff. (relative clauses).

Two examples of the *bīt īpušu* construction were suggested for K; none occurs in U.

Rarely in U, but never in K, *ša* is repeated (without purpose) in relative clauses.

D.9.c. K: 138ff.; U: 335ff.

In both dialects, other subordinate clauses are quite rare.

In K, the comparative conjunction, like the comparative

preposition, is *kē* (*ša*); *kēmē* is used for temporal clauses; *kīma* does not occur. In U, the comparative conjunction (and preposition) is *kīma*; *kē* occurs five times, twice in "that"-clauses, twice in clauses that are probably causal, and in one damaged context; *kēmē* is not attested.

In both groups, *undu* occurs, probably as a temporal conjunction.

In K, *enūma* seems to be a sentence-initial adverb rather than a conjunction. The evidence in U is less clear.

D.10.a. K: 141ff.; U: 341ff. (use of preterite and perfect).

In K letters, the normal past tense form in main clauses is the perf.; the pret. is more frequent in relative clauses. In K legal texts, the pret. is used for the "background" of a case, the perf. for the results of the judgment. In treaties, the perf. is not used. There are many exceptions to these observations, but, in general, the use of the pret. and perf. in K resembles that in MB.

In U, the pret. and perf. are often interchangeable, although there are a few observable tendencies: one or the other is always or usually used with certain verbs; the perf. is more frequent in the first clause in legal texts, and after *anumma* and *inanna*; sequences of clauses tend to have each verb in the same tense. There are many exceptions to each of these tendencies, however.

Also in U, the pret. often occurs where a dur. is expected, perhaps due to WS influence; the perf. is so used

only once. This feature is not found in K.

D.10.d. K: 153ff.; U: 355ff.

Active statives, which may occasionally reflect WS perfects, are more common in U than in K. In U, the stative is occasionally found in clauses paralleled by other clauses in which a prefix-conjugation form occurs.

D.12.b. K: 158f.; U: 365ff.

Resumptive acc. suffixes in main clauses occur sporadically in K, more often in U. In K, the referent is always a person, but in U, no such restriction exists. In neither dialect is the distance of the object from the verb, or emphasis of the object, a factor in the use or non-use of a resumptive suffix.

D.13. K: 159ff.; U: 369ff.

Examples of incomplete or interrupted grammar are infrequent in both corpora.

2. Conclusion

The above list shows that there are many differences between the Akk. dialect written at Carchemish and that written at Ugarit. Some of the differences are substantial, such as word order, use or non-use of the subjunctive, the 3fs prefix, the bound form of nouns, the use of the tenses.

The dialect of native Akk. that these two corpora resemble most closely is MB. Although both contain a sub-

stantial number of features that differ from MB, the K dialect is much closer to the native language than the U dialect is. Nearly all the deviations from MB that are found in K also occur in U, some of them much more frequently. And many additional aberrations are attested in U that do not occur in K. An interesting sidelight, however, is that the U texts exhibit a small number of OB features which do not appear in K, such as initial and medial writings of *w*, *š* before a dental, the use of *kīma* rather than *kī*.

It is clear, then, that we cannot speak of the grammar of the texts found at Ras Shamra as a unit (or, for that matter, of that of the texts found at El-Amarna, or Boghazkoy, etc.). Rather, the place of origin of a text, and its genre, must be taken into account, and the text compared with others of the same type, written in the same location; only then may *dialects*, not individual texts, from different regions be compared. When this methodology has been applied to the other major text groups in the Ras Shamra corpus, it may be possible to "place" at least some of the texts whose region of origin has been heretofore unknowable. And only when a sufficient number of dialects, in the Ras Shamra, El-Amarna, and other archives, have been described, will the study of western peripheral Akkadian be able to advance considerably.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, Hans-Peter. *Das Akkadische des Königs Tušratta von Mitanni*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1976.
- Albright, William F. "An Unrecognized Amarna Letter from Ugarit," *BASOR* 95 (1944), 30ff.
- Aro, Jussi. *Glossar zu den mittelbabylonischen Briefen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1957.
- _____. *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1961.
- _____. Review of Jean Nougayrol, *Le Palais royal d'Ugarit*, III, *AfO* 18 (1957-58), 143ff.
- _____. *Studien zur mittelbabylonischen Grammatik*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1955.
- Berger, P.-R. "Die Alašia-Briefe Ugaritica 5, Noug. Nrn. 22-24," *UF* 1 (1969), 217ff.
- _____. "Zu den 'akkadischen' Briefen Ugaritica V," *UF* 2 (1970), 285ff.
- _____. "Zu den Wirtschafts- und Rechtsurkunden Ugaritica V," *UF* 1 (1969), 121ff.
- Berkooz, Moshé. *The Nuzi Dialect of Akkadian*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania, 1937.
- Bloch, S.J. "Beiträge zur Grammatik des Mittelbabylonischen," *OrNS* 9 (1940), 305ff.
- Böhl, F.M.Th. *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1909.
- Buccellati, Giorgio. "An Interpretation of the Akkadian Stative as a Nominal Sentence," *JNES* 27 (1968), 1ff.
- Bush, Frederic W. "A Grammar of the Hurrian Language." Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1964.
- Dhorme, E. "Lettre du roi de Kargamish au roi d'Ugarit," in *Mélanges syriens offerts à Monsieur René Dussaud*, I. Paris: Paul Guenther, 1939. Pages 203ff.

- _____. "Petite tablette accadienne de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 16 (1934), 194f.
- Durham, John W. "Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian." Ph. D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1976.
- Finet, André. *L'accadien des lettres de Mari*. Bruxelles: Palais des Académies, 1956.
- Fisher, Loren R., ed. *The Claremont Ras Shamra Tablets, Analecta Orientalia* 48. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1971.
- Gamkrelidze, Th.V. "The Akkado-Hittite Syllabary and the Problem of the Origin of the Hittite Script," *ArOr* 29 (1961), 406ff.
- Gelb, I.J. "Notes on von Soden's Grammar of Akkadian," *BiOr* 12 (1955), 92ff.
- Giacumakis, George, Jr. *The Akkadian of Alalakh*. The Hague: Mouton, 1970.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. "The Dialect of the Nuzu Tablets," *OrNS* 7 (1938), 32ff., 215ff.
- _____. "Observations on the Akkadian Tablets from Ugarit," *RA* 50 (1956), 127ff.
- _____. *Ugaritic Textbook, Analecta Orientalia* 38. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1965.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. "našū-nadānu and its Congeners," in Maria de Jong Ellis, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of J.J. Finkelstein*. Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, *Memoirs* 19 (New Haven, 1977). Pages 87ff.
- Gröndahl, Frauke. *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1967.
- Hecker, Karl. *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte, Analecta Orientalia* 44. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1968.
- Herdner, Andrée. "Une Particularité grammaticale commune aux textes d'El-Amarna et de Ras-Shamra," *RÉS* 1938, 76ff.
- Joñon, Paul. *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome: Institut biblique pontifical, 1923.

- Jucquois, Guy. *Phonétique comparée des dialectes moyen-babyloniens du nord et de l'ouest*. Louvain: Institut orientaliste, Bibliothèque de l'université, 1966.
- Knudtzon, J.A. *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915. Reprinted, Aalen: Otto Zeller, 1964.
- Kühne, Cord. "Eine analytische Liste der akkadischen Ugarittexte," *UF* 6 (1974), 129ff.
- _____. "Nachträge und Berichtigungen zur analytischen Liste der akkadischen Ugarittexte," *UF* 7 (1975), 515f.
- _____. *Die Chronologie der internationalen Korrespondenz von El-Amarna*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1973.
- _____. "Mit Glossenkeilen markierte fremde Wörter in akkadischen Ugarittexten," *UF* 6 (1974), 157ff., *UF* 7 (1975), 253ff.
- Labat, René. *L'akkadien de Boghaz-Köi*. Bordeaux: Librarie Delmas, 1932.
- _____, and Malbran-Labat, Florence. *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*, 5th ed. Paris: Librarie orientaliste Paul Guenther, 1976.
- Liverani, Mario. "Antecedenti del diptotismo arabo nei testi accadici di Ugarit," *RSO* 38 (1963), 131ff.
- _____. "Karkemiš nei testi di Ugarit," *RSO* 35 (1960), 135ff.
- _____. *Storia di Ugarit*. Roma: Università di Roma, Studi semitici 6, 1962.
- _____. "Un tipo di espressione indefinita in accadico e in ugaritico," *RSO* 39 (1964), 199f.
- Marcus, R. "On the Genitive after *umma* in the Amarna Tablets," *JCS* 2 (1948), 124f.
- Matouš, Lubor. "Les textes accadiens d'Ugarit," *ArOr* 24 (1956), 375ff.
- Mayer, Walter. *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik des Mittelassyrischen*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1971.

- Moran, William L. "The Dual Personal Pronouns in Western Peripheral Akkadian," *BASOR* 211 (1973), 50ff.
- _____. "Early Canaanite *yaqtula*," *OrNS* 29 (1960), 1ff.
- _____. "A Syntactical Study of the Dialect of Byblos as Reflected in the Amarna Tablets." Ph. D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1950.
- _____. "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters," in H. Goedicke, ed., *Unity and Diversity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1975. Pages 146ff.
- Nougayrol, Jean. "Une fable hittite," *Revue hittite et asiatique* 67 (1960), 117ff.
- _____. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, III (MRS VI)*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1955.
- _____. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, IV (MRS IX)*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1956.
- _____. *Le palais royal d'Ugarit, VI (MRS XII)*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1970.
- _____, Laroche, Emmanuel; Virolleaud, Charles; Schaeffer, Claude F.A. *Ugaritica V (MRS XVI)*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1968.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo, et al., eds. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: the Oriental Institute, 1956ff.
- Parker, S.B. "Studies in the Grammar of the Ugaritic Prose Texts." Ph. D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967.
- Patterson, Richard D. "Old Babylonian Parataxis as Exhibited in the Royal Letters of the Middle Old Babylonian Period and in the Code of Hammurapi." Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970.
- Rainey, Anson F. "Enclitic *-ma* and the Logical Predicate in Old Babylonian," *IOS* 6 (1976), 51ff.
- _____. "Gleanings from Ugarit," *IOS* 3 (1973), 34ff.
- _____. "More Gleanings from Ugarit," *IOS* 5 (1975), 18ff.
- _____. "Morphology and the Prefix-Tenses of West Semitized El-Amarna Tablets," *UF* 7 (1975), 395ff.

- _____. "Reflections on the Suffix Conjugations in West Semitized Amarna Tablets," *UF* 5 (1973), 235ff.
- Rowton, M.B. "The Use of the Permissive in Classic Babylonian," *JNES* 21 (1962), 233ff.
- Salonen, Erkki. *Die Gruss- und Höflichkeitsformeln in babylonisch-assyrischen Briefen*. Helsinki: Societas Orientalis Fennica, 1967.
- Speiser, E.A. "Akkadian Documents from Ras Shamra," *JAOS* 75 (1955), 154ff.
- _____. *Introduction to Hurrian*. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941.
- Swaim, Gerald G. "A Grammar of the Akkadian Tablets found at Ugarit." Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1962.
- Thureau-Dangin, F. "Un comptoir de laine pourpre à Ugarit d'après une tablette de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 15 (1934), 137ff.
- _____. "Trois contrats de Ras-Shamra," *Sy* 18 (1937), 237ff.
- Tsevat, Matitiahu. "Marriage and Monarchical Legitimacy in Ugarit and Israel," *JSS* 3 (1958), 237ff.
- Ungnad, Artur, and Matouš, Lubor. *Grammatik des Akkadischen*, 5th ed. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1969.
- Viirolleaud, Charles. "Cinq tablettes accadiennes de Ras-Shamra," *RA* 38 (1941), 1ff.
- _____. "Six textes de Ras Shamra," *Sy* 28 (1951), 163ff.
- von Soden, Wolfram. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965ff.
- _____. *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik samt Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik*, *Analecta Orientalia* 33, 47. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1969.
- _____, and Röllig, Wolfgang. *Das akkadische Syllabar*, *Analecta Orientalia* 42. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1976.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. *Untersuchungen zum Hurro-Akkadischen von Nuzi*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer, 1970.

Wiseman, D.J. *The Alalakh Tablets*. London: the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1953.

Wright, W. *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, 3rd ed., revised by W. Robertson Smith and M.J. de Goeje. Cambridge: the University Press, 1971.